

## HOW JUSTINIAN I SOUGHT TO HANDLE THE PROBLEM OF RELIGIOUS DISSENT\*

WILLIAM S. THURMAN

Regarding the emperor's use of laws in order to achieve conformity, the following rationale may be inferred from scattered statements:

He claimed a *common superintendency* (κοινὴ ἐπιστάσια) over his realm, an overseership that included matters of religion.<sup>1</sup> He felt that God would reward the orthodox religion of his subjects with the blessings of material prosperity.<sup>2</sup> But he felt even more responsible for the salvation of his subjects than for worldly matters (κοσμικαὶ αἰτίαι).<sup>3</sup> He was certain of his authority to make laws for his subjects, of their validity as a means of moulding opinion, and therefore of his responsibility to enact them.<sup>4</sup>

One must not forget that religious sentiment appears almost as prominent in the civil, as in the ecclesiastical, enactments of Justinian. The same word "divine" (θεῖος) is used to describe either an orthodox dogma or imperial legislation.<sup>5</sup> In all his corrective measures he claimed to have God before his eyes and to

---

\* This article is a revision of a paper presented in the 1967 Symposium at the Harvard Center for Byzantine Studies, Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C.

---

<sup>1</sup> Nov. (= *Iustiniani Novellae* edd. R. Schoell, W. Kroll, in *Corpus Iuris Civilis* vol. 3 (Berlin: Weidmann 1963); where it is thought advisable for the sake of convenience to make the reference more specific, the citation of the Novel and section is followed by a citation of the volume, page or pages and line or lines of this edition of the *Corpus Iuris Civilis*; e.g. Nov. 146,3:CIC 3,717,22-25 means that that part of the 3rd section of the 146th Novel referred to is found from the 22nd to the 25th line of page 717 of the 3rd volume of said edition of the *Corpus Iuris Civilis*.) 133,pr.

<sup>2</sup> Nov. 133,5,1.

<sup>3</sup> Nov. 115,3,14.

<sup>4</sup> Cod. (= *Codex Iustinianus* ed. P. Krueger, in *Corpus Iuris Civilis* vol. 2 (Berlin: Weidmann 1959); the order of my citation is book, title, law and section, like those given by C. Pharr after his abbreviation CJ, and not like the antique reference which places law and section before book and title.) 1,15,18,1; Nov. 73,pr,1: CIC 3,364,22-25.

<sup>5</sup> Nov. 146,3; CIC 3,717,22-25: μάθημα θεῖον, θεῖος νόμος.

seek his approval.<sup>6</sup> He instructed his citizens to send aloft hymns to Jesus for a civil decree that would enable them to live securely, to maintain firm possession of their property, and to enjoy justice.<sup>7</sup> He compared his law against prostitution to an incense offering; his diligence in suppressing sin would make God propitious to the realm and result in its general prosperity.<sup>8</sup> Since his benefits were not limited to select personages, he asked the prayers of all in common for the victory of his armies; as in the theory of ordeal by battle espoused by Dante in *de Monarchia*, he took such conquests as proof that his cause was righteous.<sup>9</sup>

Justinian incessantly invoked the divine will and divine guidance. For example, he committed to God the transportation of the auspicious cargo of grain from Alexandria to Constantinople (he was far less confident of its exaction and preparation within Egypt).<sup>10</sup>

He required that essentially civil enactments, on the basis of their pious intent, be placed among the holy vessels within the sanctuaries of churches.<sup>11</sup>

As we have seen, Justinian not only distinguished civil, from religious, matters, but also set their relative importance in marked contrast: if he was anxious for worldly cases, he had to exercise far more provident concern for the salvation of souls.<sup>12</sup> To render God propitious to the state was paramount among his professed legislative goals. We have seen that he felt the grace of God necessary to military success. He also felt it necessary to prosperous cities, peace, public order, flourishing crops, and even seafood. In order to procure "... such blessings, his subjects must please God, and the residents ..." of monasteries were legally obliged to show themselves "worthy protagonists of monastic philosophy."<sup>13</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Nov. 18, pr.

<sup>7</sup> Nov. 8, 11.

<sup>8</sup> Nov. 14 in παραλλαγή: *adiectum*.

<sup>9</sup> Nov. 159, epil.; Dante, *de Monarchia* 2, 10: "quod per duellam adquiritur, de iure adquiritur."

<sup>10</sup> Ed. (= *Iustiniani XIII Edicta quae vocantur*, i.e. Appendix I to Nov.: CIC 3,759-795.) 13, 5.

<sup>11</sup> Nov. 9, pr. & epil.; Ed. 1, pr. = Edictum post Nov. 8.

<sup>12</sup> Nov. 115, 3, 14.

<sup>13</sup> Nov. 133, 5, 1: CIC 3,674, 8; Nov. 5, 3 ἀγωνίσται μοναχικῆς φιλοσοφίας.

His foremost concern for his subjects was to save their souls, and to this end they were all put under legal compulsion (1) to belong to the orthodox faith; (2) to worship the trinity; and (3) to revere Mary.<sup>14</sup> He felt that his laws could reform any commitment to a perverse creed that had misled the minds of his subjects.<sup>15</sup> Procopius characterized Justinian's ideal of absolute conformity with the following statement of purpose:

to close all the roads which lead to error and to place religion on the firm foundation of a single faith.<sup>16</sup>

In accordance with this objective, a candidate for the bishopric was compelled to rehearse and to sign a statement of orthodoxy, so that the simple might be protected from the doctrines of non-conformists.<sup>17</sup>

Justinian held to a theological interpretation of kingship; in his view the royal office and priestly office were derived from the same divine source. Moreover, as the holder of the royal power, he professed that his greatest concern was for the veneration of priests of God and the true doctrines of God.<sup>18</sup> His theoretical nearness to the priesthood formed part of his rationale for regulating the church in its material resources and business relations:

The priestly power and the royal power are not widely separated, and sacred property is not far removed from that which all mankind holds in common (κοινά), or from that which is owned by the state (δημόσια), because the Churches are endowed with all their material resources and with their status by the munificence of the royal power; therefore if they mutually exchange appropriate holdings no one could reasonably find fault with it.<sup>19</sup>

On the other hand, it is incorrect to say that our sources made no distinction between civil and religious matters; for Justinian, as we have seen, drew a distinction in their relative importance: if he was careful to see that his subjects kept the civil laws, he

<sup>14</sup> Cod. 1,5,18,pr.

<sup>15</sup> Cod. 1,5,18,1 «τὴν οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἐμπεσοῦσαν ταῖς αὐτῶν διανοίαις προαίρεσιν.»

<sup>16</sup> Proc. (=Procopius), *aed.* (= *de aedificiis*) 1,1.

<sup>17</sup> Cod. 1,5,20,3; Nov. 137,2.

<sup>18</sup> Nov. 6,pr.

<sup>19</sup> Nov. 7,2,1.

should be even more diligent to see that they, especially the bishops, kept the sacred canons.<sup>20</sup> He considered his personal theological treatises (λόγοι), along with his edicts, as proof of his orthodoxy. As Alivisatos has pointed out, his treatises were often elaborations of his laws and his laws condensations of his treatises.<sup>21</sup> He professed to follow the canons of the Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus the earlier, and Chalcedon; and, in accordance with the consonant unity (συμφωνία) of civil and ecclesiastical power that he proposed, he accorded the canons of these councils the force of imperial laws.<sup>22</sup>

Let us briefly examine the posture of his immediate predecessors. According to Evagrius, the peaceable Anastasius had pursued a moderate religious policy. The decrees of Chalcedon were neither openly upheld nor denounced in the churches. Perhaps Anastasius had hoped to avoid all entanglement in religious disputes, aside from curbing the excesses of fanatics. He was later accused of befriending heretics through fondness for his mother, who was suspected of Manichaeism, and his uncle, who was charged with Arianism.<sup>23</sup> Justin and Justinian, however, imparted a new direction to religious policy. They did not coddle any minor factions; they tightened the enforcement of long-neglected legal obstructions to heterodoxy. Only between the major factions of Monophysites and Chalcedonians did Justinian ever seem to assume the role of mediator. But even in this supposed compromise, we are left in doubt regarding the extent to which his heart was swayed by theology and Theodora respectively.<sup>24</sup>

Did Justinian indeed, with regard to the monophysite faith, subscribe to the definition of heresy set forth in the Theodosian Code: "those who have been caught deviating even with slight discrepancy from the decision and pathway of Catholic Religion"?<sup>25</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Nov. 137, pr.

<sup>21</sup> H. S. Alivisatos, *Die kirchliche Gesetzgebung des Kaisers Justinian I* (Berlin 1913) p. 8; Nov. 132.

<sup>22</sup> Cod. 1,1,7,11; Nov. 131,1 (a.=anno 545).

<sup>23</sup> Evagrius (= *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius* edd. J. Bidez, L. Parmentier (London 1898) in *Byzantine Texts* ed. J. B. Bury) 3,30,32; cf. Theodorus lector 2,6.

<sup>24</sup> Proc. HA (= *historia arcana: ἀνέκδοτα*) 10,13-16; cf. Evagrius 4, 32, and the Manichaeism of Peter Barsymes in Proc. HA 22,25.

<sup>25</sup> CTh (= Codex Theodosianus edd. Th. Mommsen, P. M. Meyer



There is evidence that monophysites were condemned under the title of Manichaeans. Xenaëas, who was also called Philoxenus, was exiled by Justin I, along with Peter of Apameia, on the charge of being "Manichee-minded" (μανιχαϊόφρων).<sup>26</sup>

Furthermore, in his Treatise (λόγος) against the Monophysites, Justinian himself equated the doctrine of Timotheus Aelyrus of Alexandria with Manichaeism.<sup>27</sup>

There is no hesitancy on the part of Justinian to decree the civil enforcement of conciliar decisions. In confirming the deposition of Anthimus, Severus, Peter and Zoaras, Justinian maintained that the imperial power had always supported the decrees of councils in deposing such non-conformists as Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Macedonius, and Eunomius.<sup>28</sup> Novel 6 (a. 535), after requiring that a candidate for a bishopric must have read the sacred canons and must pledge to uphold them, provided that, if he should be appointed and fail to do so, the civil laws (πολιτικοὶ νόμοι) would not leave him unpunished. We have referred to the imperial decrees that accorded to the sacred canons the force of civil laws.<sup>29</sup> Justinian effected a "harmonious blend" (συμφωνία) of civil and ecclesiastical power, not only in the substance of the laws, but also in their enforcement. A law forbidding the celebration of divine mysteries in private homes was submitted to both the praetorian prefect and the patriarch, in order that "by virtue of both the civil and the sacral power it might be forever observed."<sup>30</sup> Not only were civil officials called upon to enforce religious enactments, but officials of the church served as eyes and ears for the state in political matters.

Although Justinian called upon men of every rank to inform the emperor of any violation of his laws, bishops were often designated to serve as spies and informants for the emperor.<sup>31</sup> They

---

3 vols. (Berlin 1905)) 16,5,28 ". . . qui vel levi argumento iudicio catholicae religionis et tramite detecti fuerint deviare."

<sup>26</sup> Theophanes (= *Chronographia* ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig 1883, 1885)) 255.

<sup>27</sup> MPG (= *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, series Graeco-Latina*, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris 1857- 1866)) 86/1, 1127D, written after Zoilus became Patriarch of Alexandria aa. 542-551.

<sup>28</sup> Nov. 42, pr. 3.

<sup>29</sup> Nov. 6, 1; 131, 1; 133, epil.; Cod. 1, 1, 7, 11.

<sup>30</sup> Nov. 58: CIC 3, 315, 24-27 συμφωνία; Nov. 6, pr.

<sup>31</sup> Nov. 133, 1.6: CIC 3, 675, 16-25; 6, epil.; Cod. 1, 4, 22; 1, 4, 26, 2-3; 3, 2, 4, 6; 9, 4, 6, 9.

were charged to report to him the behavior of both civil and military officials. The entire preface to Edict 1 is concerned with this matter, and is characterized by the following extract:

This edict will be consecrated to our Lord God, but you (all the bishops) shall render an account to him for the injustice done by others, if any injury is inflicted on your parishioners without our being informed of it.

The clergy had to maintain constant surveillance of persons suspected of heresy, and whenever a magistrate seemed to disregard the suspicions that they had reported to him, they were obliged to inform the emperor.<sup>32</sup> They were asked to inform against actors, actresses, or prostitutes who wore monastic habits or satirized monastic life.<sup>33</sup>

Before turning to his specific opposition to heresy, we shall notice his laws coping with moral deviations. The letter of such laws is so often harsh and coercive that one senses either the desperation of ineffectuality or the intolerance of despotism. Men who contracted illegal marriages were ordered slain, and even the wife and children of such a marriage would lose all of their property and part of their body; and in more serious cases of ἀθεμιτογαμία their dependents were threatened with their very lives.<sup>34</sup> (In sharp contrast to this bleak picture was the new and liberal license that he extended to men adorned with dignities to marry women previously forbidden to them as "cheap" εὐτελείς: *abietae*.)<sup>35</sup> Since he feared that, if his subjects became unnatural deviates, their cities would be swept away to perdition like Sodom, he sought to curtail homosexuality; homosexuals were confronted with death, and, according to Procopius, a cruel death.<sup>36</sup> But we may take as an example of the mitigation of his declining years the season of respite given homosexuals in a. 559. During Lent of that year they were allowed to surrender themselves in repentance. Nevertheless, if they should fail to do so, he menaced them with a thorough inquisition after Easter.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>32</sup> Cod. 1,5,12,22; 1,5,18,12.

<sup>33</sup> Cod. 5,4,29; Nov. 8,8,1 & Edictum; 8,9; 128,23-24; 134,3.

<sup>34</sup> Nov. 22,15-16; 154,1; CIC 3,730,14.

<sup>35</sup> Cod. 5,5,7; 5,27,1; Nov. 117,6.

<sup>36</sup> Nov. 77,1; Proc. HA 11,36.

<sup>37</sup> ζήτησις: Nov. 141 (Mar. 15,559).

Among his reforms one may find some more merciful features of social amelioration. His institutional charity — orphanages, old folks' homes, hospitals — has been rehearsed by D. J. Constantelos.<sup>38</sup>

As a legislative act of piety he abolished the requirement that widows who undertook the guardianship of their own children must swear not to contract another marriage; for he observed that this oath had repeatedly led to perjury.<sup>39</sup> A genuine interest in the personal freedom of citizens is expressed in laws that extend full citizenship to freedmen, that enjoin landowners to avoid the forcible separation of families of *coloni*, that release actresses from any oaths, pledges or sureties to continue in their occupation, that prevent the detention of females by public officials (on the grounds that some officials had violated the chastity of their prisoners), and that prevent the reclaiming to servitude of children who had been exposed as infants, in order that the church might nurture and educate them in childhood.<sup>40</sup> He also sought to prevent the abduction of nuns.<sup>41</sup>

It is impossible for me to provide an exact definition of what *heresy* meant to Justinian; as with many other ancients, his inconsistencies seem to lie in a lack of semantic precision. He used αἵρεσις in its longstanding, non-technical sense of "choice, proclivity, or adherence":

He who has been nurtured in the sacred books is far readier for a choosing of the better.<sup>42</sup>

The term had been applied to both the major and the minor philosophies of Graeco-Roman antiquity, and to their collective partisans. In translating αἵρεσις, the English noun *tenet* is convenient for stressing the notions of adherence and creed, while the phrase "school of thought" serves well to bring out simultaneously the ideas of both central dogma and a collective party.

Even as applied to Christianity, αἵρεσις had not been invariably

---

<sup>38</sup> D. J. Constantelos, "Philanthropy in the Age of Justinian," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* VI. 2 (Winter 1960-61), 206-226.

<sup>39</sup> Nov. 94,2-epil.

<sup>40</sup> Nov. 14; 51; 78,pr.; 134,9,1; 153,pr-1; 157.

<sup>41</sup> Cod. 1,3,53; Karl-Heinz Fritz, *Studien zur Justinianischen Reformgesetzgebung*: Inaug. — Diss. Friedrich-Wilhelms Universitaet (Quackenbrueck: Trute 1937) 45-53.

<sup>42</sup> Nov. 146,3.

pejorative; for the Apostle Paul did not repudiate its application to Christians as distinct from non-Christian schools of thought. And as late as the codes of Theodosius and Justinian the Latin translation *secta* is applied without apology to the major Catholic Church; nevertheless, the word was most commonly used of heterodox parties.<sup>43</sup>

Justinian looked upon what he called "divine learning" (θεῖον μάθημα) as the only approved creed; among available faiths, it was more than a "mere name of preference."<sup>44</sup> Although he might through implication or inadvertently apply the name *Christian* to certain heretics, he usually drew a technical distinction between *heretic* and *Christian* as strictly antithetical terms.<sup>45</sup>

A more difficult problem is whether parties of non-Christians should be understood among *heresies*. Most *seriatim* lists tend to coordinate heretics with Jews, Samaritans, pagans, or others.<sup>46</sup> But one such list has Jew, Samaritan, Greek, Montanist, Arian, or *other* heretic. At first glance, this seems to imply that Jews, Samaritans and Greeks are officially regarded as heretics, but in the very next section of the same enactment (Novel 131, 14, 2-3), Jews are regarded as distinct from heretics; one seems forced to conclude that *other heretics* therefore has as a base of reference only the immediately preceding terms *Montanist* and *Arian*. On the other hand, an enactment of Justin II clearly labeled the Samaritan religion a *heresy*.<sup>47</sup> And Justinian's conscious definitions of heresy are certainly broad enough to include all non-Catholics; with Justin he said:

We term everyone a heretic who does not belong to the Catholic Church and to our orthodox and holy faith.<sup>48</sup>

The expression "our faith" is reminiscent of the *acclamatio*

<sup>43</sup> venerabilis orthodoxorum secta: CTh 16,5,66,1: Cod. 1,5,6,1; cf. Acts of Apostles 24,5,14; 28,22; nefanda secta: NTh (= *Novellae Theodosianae* ed. with CTh) 3,4: Cod. 1,7,5.

<sup>44</sup> ἡ ψιλὴ τῆς αἰρέσεως προσηγορία: Nov. 146,3.

<sup>45</sup> Cod. 1,5,12,7: "lest they (heretics) outrage other Christians, especially bishops . . ."; Nov. 131,14 (a. 545) «ὅστις αἰρετικοῖς χριστιανοῦς προδίδωκεν.»

<sup>46</sup> Alivisatos 32; Cod. 1,5,12,9; 1,5,13,3; 1,10,2; 1,5,21,pr. "nemini haeretico vel etiam his qui Iudaicam superstitionem colunt."

<sup>47</sup> Nov. 1,44,pr.

<sup>48</sup> Cod. 1,5,12,4; cf. Proc. HA 11,14.

(ἐκδόσεις) at the conclusion of a council, wherein the bishops all shouted:

fides vestra doctrina est ecclesiae.

Not only matters of faith, but of ritual, were included in his general definitions:

αἱρέσεις δὲ καλοῦμεν τὰς παρὰ τὴν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὴν ὀρθόδοξον πίστιν φρονούσας τε καὶ θρησκευσούσας.<sup>49</sup>

One list contains both specific and general clauses: First, he claimed to follow the emperors Leo and Justin in anathematizing Nestorians, Eutychians, Acephali, and followers of Dioscorus and Severus; then, he added any who were not members of the Catholic Church and whose identity was revealed by their failure to receive communion from the priests:

Even if they wear the name of Christians, they are known to expose themselves to the judgment of God by separating themselves from the true faith and the communion of Christians.<sup>50</sup>

Justinian's anti-heretical opprobrium and invective is remarkable. It is partly traditional, but his refinements reveal his own attitude toward dissent. He imputed to them not only deceit (ἀπάτη) and error (πλάνη), but also madness (μανία, ἀλογία) and sickness (νόσος).<sup>51</sup> To him heretical conversion was "an appropriation to insanity,"<sup>52</sup> Eutyches a man of damaged wit (φρενοβλαβής),<sup>53</sup> Apollinarius a corrupter of the soul (ψυχοφθόρος),<sup>54</sup> monophysites "sick with the malice of Dioscorus and Severus, who have renovated the impiety of the Manichaeans and Apollinarius." Samaritans, perhaps because of insurgent tendencies, were said to have launched into extreme mental deficiency (ἀπόνοια).<sup>55</sup> Paganism and Judaism *superstitioes*.<sup>56</sup> The Christology

<sup>49</sup> Cod. 1,5,18,4.

<sup>50</sup> Nov. 109,pr.

<sup>51</sup> Nov. 42,3,1; 109,pr.; 132,pr.; Ed. 2,1 et passim.

<sup>52</sup> Nov. 37,5 " . . . ad suum furorem trahere . . . "

<sup>53</sup> Nov. 42,3,1; Cod. 1,1,5,3; 1,1,6,8.

<sup>54</sup> Cod. 1,1,5,3; 1,1,6,9.

<sup>55</sup> Nov. 129,pr.

<sup>56</sup> Cod. 1,5,21,pr-1.

of Nestorius *Judaic*, his madness *Jewish* madness.<sup>57</sup> Hellenic, or pagan, piety irreverence or warped piety.<sup>58</sup> He was rich in figures of pollution. He spoke, not of their teaching, but of their abominable dogmas and defilements.<sup>59</sup> Individuals among them most criminal and defiled,<sup>60</sup> and even "snot."<sup>61</sup> Almost never does any facet of dissenting faith or practice appear under the standard terms that are used for analogous points of Catholicism. Their faith was *kakodoxy*; his own was *orthodoxy*.<sup>62</sup> Anthimus was not converted, but "kidnapped into servitude by alien doctrine."<sup>63</sup> Heretical baptisms were "misbaptisms,"<sup>64</sup> their assemblies "miscongregations,"<sup>65</sup> and their meeting places "improper lairs of beasts" or "dens of infidelity."<sup>66</sup>

To sum it up, Justinian baldly stated "We hate heretics."<sup>67</sup> Justinian's Code and Novels must share blame for the notorious semantic prejudice against dissent and in favor of conformity that has been historically endemic throughout much of the West.

In the very first article of the short *ἐκθεσις*, which is really a *speculum regni*, addressed to the emperor by Agapetus Diaconus, we find "God gave you the sceptre . . . to dispel the barking of those who rage against him."<sup>68</sup> Justinian reaffirmed this sentiment in a Novel of a. 544: After asserting that, since the paramount good for all men is to confess the true faith, every heretical device must be dispelled, Justinian stated:

But inasmuch as heretics, who respect neither God nor the penalties threatened by my severe laws, eagerly execute the work of the devil, and, by seducing the simple away from the true church, furtively hold misgatherings and misbaptisms, I deemed it pious to persuade them through this edict that

---

<sup>57</sup> Cod. 1,1,7,4; Nov. 115,3,14.

<sup>58</sup> Cod. 1,11,9,pr.-1 : ἀσεβήματα, δυσσέβεια.

<sup>59</sup> Nov. 42,1,1 : βδελυρὰ δόγματα, μᾶσματα.

<sup>60</sup> Nov. 37,5 *sceleratissimi, inquinati*.

<sup>61</sup> Nov. 45,pr. καταπτύστοι : *respuendi*.

<sup>62</sup> Cod. 1,5,20,6.

<sup>63</sup> Nov. 42,1,pr.

<sup>64</sup> Nov. 42,3,1 παραβαπτίσματα.

<sup>65</sup> Nov. 132,pr.; Cod. 1,5,14,20,2 : παρὰ συνάξεις.

<sup>66</sup> Nov. 67,1; 131,14,2 σπήλαια ἄτοπα or σπήλαια ἀπιστίας : speluncae; cf. CTh 16,5,57,2 *antra feralia*.

<sup>67</sup> Nov. 45,pr. et 1 in fine.

<sup>68</sup> MPG 86/1, 1164A.

they abandon their heretical insanity and cease to destroy the souls of others through their deception, and rather that they scurry to the Holy Church of God where correct doctrine is expounded and all heresies, together with their protagonists, are accursed. For we want all to know that, in the future, if any persons are caught either convening or attending such misgatherings, we shall no longer tolerate it, but we will award the houses where any such misdeed is perpetrated to the Holy Church and command that the legal punishment be imposed on the persons involved.<sup>69</sup>

He proposed to enhance the *security* of the orthodox. In practice, this meant to insulate them from non-conformist sentiment, in a paternalistic manner. He expressed special concern lest, if heretics be allowed to hold meetings, they might win back Catholics who had renounced heresy.<sup>70</sup>

Unlike Pliny the Younger under Trajan, magistrates under Justinian were not left in doubt about whether they should ferret out dissenters. The emperor clearly enunciated the principle of inquisition. Such verbs as ἀναζητέω and διερευνάω were repeatedly used.<sup>71</sup> According to the Secret History, a special police court, headed by the praetor of the people and the quaestor, was set up for the punishment of immorality and heresy.<sup>72</sup> We have the very enactment which creates the office of πραιτωρ δήμων, but it does not *specify* heresy as his peculiar concern; that Novel does, however, state in general terms that he was charged with preserving public order and providing for what was expedient to the public.<sup>73</sup> Nov. 80 says that the crown devised this magistracy in order to diminish misdemeanors or sins.<sup>74</sup> Furthermore, their supervision of public morals is attested by Novel 14, which reveals that they had been charged to investigate (ἀναζητεῖν) the extent of prostitution in Constantinople. (Their jurisdiction was said to extend to the "theft of modesty as well as money.")<sup>75</sup> There is also evidence in the laws that special courts to hear cases involving heresy sat in the provinces. Novel 17, 11 explicitly authorized

<sup>69</sup> Nov. 132.

<sup>70</sup> Cod. 1,5,20,5; 1,5,15; 1,11,9; 1,5,16,1.

<sup>71</sup> Proc. HA 20,9.

<sup>72</sup> Nov. 13,1,1.

<sup>73</sup> Nov. 80, pr. πλημμελήματα.

<sup>74</sup> Nov. 14, pr. : CIC 3,106,35-41; Nov. 14,1 : CIC 3,107,32.

combined civil and religious courts for trying heresy under provincial administrators:

You shall by no means permit anyone to plunder your province on the grounds of inquisition of religions and heresies; nor shall you allow such a function to be delegated in some other way within the area under your control; but you shall take precaution yourself for what is appropriate and beneficial to the public treasury, both to investigate such matters and to prevent anything from being done contrary to the orders that we ourselves issue in cases involving religion. And if the subject of investigation is canonical you shall adjudge the matter together with the metropolitan of the province (whether the parties to the dispute are bishops or others) and terminate the matter with a divinely approved and appropriate adjudication, which will preserve the honor of the orthodox faith, insure the indemnity of the public treasury and keep the rights of our subjects from being violated.

Edict 2, 1 implies that fraudulent courts of inquisition were widespread:

Your Glory (the praetorian prefect) has informed us that certain men have descended on various provinces to hold inquisitions and to search out those who have abandoned themselves to the error of the heretics, that they have arrested many of our taxpayers on this charge, and that they have taken much gold as judicial fees.

Informants played a significant role in exposing heretics. Civil and religious functionaries were induced to watch one another, clergymen to watch their parishioners, and laymen to inform against each other.<sup>75</sup> The one sure way for a former Manichaean to establish the sincerity of his orthodoxy was by betraying Manichaeans who had been his coreligionists. Such a delation was ordered before the legally authorized judge (νόμιμος δικαστής may imply a specialist in heresy).<sup>76</sup>

Let us consider some of the principal groups of dissenters

---

<sup>75</sup> Nov. 133,1.6; 8,8,1 Edictum; 8,9; 128,23-24; 134,3; Cod. 1,4,22; 1,4,26,2-3; 1,5,12,22; 1,5,18,12; 3,2,4,6; 5,4,29; 9,4,6,9.

<sup>76</sup> Cod. 1,5,16,5 : «διὰ τούτου μόνου δέλξουσιν...»



against whom Justinian directed his legislation.

The Manichaeans and Borborites were most odious of all to Justinian.<sup>77</sup> This intense odium seems symptomatic of anti-Persian sentiment.<sup>78</sup> They were the first to whom he denied the right of either testate or intestate succession; unless they had orthodox children who would divide their property, all other relations were excluded and it was confiscated.<sup>79</sup> The death penalty was reserved for two principal kinds of religious offenders: Manichaeans who neglected to flee from their domicile and Catholics who lapsed into heresy.<sup>80</sup> Converts to Catholicism received special warning against apostatizing to Manichaeism: they should not stretch the kindness of the emperor, for they would find none of his famous philanthropy.<sup>81</sup>

Justinian held pagans in the same odium as Manichaeans and Borborites. The intellectual world received a heavy blow when Justinian closed the school of philosophy at Athens; but a far more consequential aspect of his rage against pagan philosophy was his general ban on Hellenic teachers anywhere within the empire. Justinian protested that the *truths* men might learn from pagans would corrupt their souls.<sup>82</sup> The penalty for pagan sacrifice was death and proprietors who consented to the use of their property for such rites lost the property, were subjected to torture, and were condemned to the mines.<sup>83</sup>

It is difficult to determine whether the Samaritans were less odious. An enactment in the Code demanded the demolition of their synagogues and forbade the transfer of their property to non-Catholics, by any kind of alienation, gift or inheritance.<sup>83b</sup> A Novel of a. 551 complains that departments of the treasury had exceeded the provisions of this law in confiscating the property of Samaritans,<sup>84</sup> and rescinds the law on the grounds that the

---

<sup>77</sup> Cod. 1,5,18,2.

<sup>78</sup> Alivisatos p. 32, n. 6.

<sup>79</sup> Cod. 1,5,15,19.

<sup>80</sup> Cod. 1,5,12,3; 1,5,16,2; Proc. HA 11.

<sup>81</sup> Cod. 1,5,16,2.

<sup>82</sup> Cod. 1,5,16,3; 1,11,10,4; Proc. BG (= *Bellum Gothicum*) 1; Evagrius 4,20; Malalas (= *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia* ed L. D. Dindorf (Bonn 1831) = *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae* vol. 15) 187; MPG 86/2, 2737C-2740A.

<sup>83</sup> Cod. 1,11,7-8.

<sup>83b</sup> Cod. 1,5,17.

<sup>84</sup> Nov. 129,pr.

Samaritans had tempered their madness, and out of respect for Sergius the Bishop of Caesarea, whose intercession had moved Justinian to clemency. The Novel restored to them the rights of making wills, of granting legacies, of receiving inheritances and legacies, and of making donations. In matters of succession, however, Catholics took precedence over other potential heirs of the same degree of kingship. Nevertheless, if a Samaritan should be overlooked on this basis, but later became a Catholic, he might apply for any portion that he would have received had he been a Catholic. In a. 572, Justin II, prompted by instances in which the baptized had reverted to Samaritanism, revived the testamentary and commercial penalties of the Code. He regarded their keeping the Sabbath after baptism as proof of their insincerity.<sup>85</sup>

In perversity, Montanists were rated with Samaritans, Tasodrug, and Ophites. Since they were similarly detestable to Justinian, sympathetic and merciful citizens were warned not to relieve the woes of their exile. Any who afforded material relief or protection were fined 10 pounds of gold. This hatred and condemnation was pronounced *righteous*.<sup>86</sup>

That the Jews experienced comparatively mild treatment seems a reasonable inference from their not being named among dissenting groups in some of the laws that prescribed harsher penalties, and from the series of restrictions and exemptions specifically directed to them in the 9th title of the 1st book of the Code (e.g. exemption from public *munera* on the Sabbath, restriction from marrying a Christian woman or having Christian servants).<sup>87</sup>

They were not permitted to build any new synagogues; this prohibition was preserved in the Code and a general law of a. 545 assigned all new synagogues to the Church.<sup>88</sup> After his conquest of Africa Justinian converted the African synagogues into churches.<sup>89</sup>

The Hebrews of Tyre (aa. 535-7) were permitted to break his restrictions against marrying within too close a degree of kinship upon a pecuniary condition: if they paid 10 pounds of gold, they were allowed to keep such wives and not required to forfeit a fourth of their property. I do not know whether Procopius' accusation that Justinian broke his own laws, when money was in

<sup>85</sup> Nov. 144,1.

<sup>86</sup> Cod. 1,5,18,3; 1,5,20,3,7 : παραψυχή, προστασία.

<sup>87</sup> Cod. 1,9,2,6; 1,10,2.

<sup>88</sup> Cod. 1,9,18 : NTh 3,2 . . . 5; Nov. 131,14,2.

<sup>89</sup> Nov. 37,5 (a. 535).

sight, applies just here, for one does not know whether 10 pounds from each man desirous of the privilege or  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the estate of each violator would have been the larger sum; furthermore, the question was not one of violation, but of legislative revision.<sup>90</sup>

In the year 553 Justinian imposed regulations on synagogue worship. In order that they might understand the prophecies of Christ, he forbade readings in Hebrew alone and required a version readily understood by the people (e.g. LXX or Aquila). Bodily punishment threatened any who impeded services in a second language, or who vociferated against the resurrection, judgment, providence, or the creation of angels. Furthermore, the practice of Deuterosis — perhaps the chanting of scribal traditions — was strictly forbidden.<sup>91</sup> The *Secret History* asserts that he forbade flesh to be eaten before the Catholic date for Easter — an ordinance prejudicial to Passover observance in some years. Is it possible that a longer Lenten abstinence had such an unwholesome origin?<sup>92</sup>

What was Justinian's philosophy of punishment? His own benevolence was analogous to the divine; just as the plague led men to repent, even so the punishments that he prescribed were regarded as regal philanthropy. He felt that penalties should cause such severe pain that the punishment of a few would induce the general population to live soberly.<sup>93</sup>

In a. 556 this notorious philanthropy was modified; for, just after decreeing that the paramour of a married woman who attempted to marry her either during or after the lifetime of her husband should be tortured to death, he forbade, in cases that did not call for death, amputation as a torture, *unless it was specified in the law*, and he directed that, even then, only one hand or foot should be severed. He also expressed a distaste for separation of the joints; and modified the rules of confiscation so that wives, descendants, and even ascendants who had not been accessories to

---

<sup>90</sup> Nov. 139; Proc. HA 27,21-23.26-33; Evagrius 4,30 attests his extraordinary avarice.

<sup>91</sup> Nov. 146; Epiphanius of Salamis (ca. a. 400), *Haer.*: MPG 41, 572A-B: «παράδοσεις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων δευτερώσεις παρὰ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις λέγονται.»

<sup>92</sup> Proc. HA 28,16.

<sup>93</sup> Nov. 2,pr.,1: CIC 3,11,38-39; Nov. 30,11,pr. «οὕτω κολάζεται πικρῶς»: "let him punish so stringently."

a crime might receive their share of the property.<sup>94</sup> The fact that it was necessary to legislate against unauthorized and excessive mutilation supports the inference that it was widely practiced under his reign, even in cases not specified by the laws.

The amputations in Constantinople were carried out under the newly created praetor of the people, who, before inflicting punishment, was enjoined to take cognizance of the charges against the criminal.<sup>95</sup>

Justinian personally preferred exile and confiscation as punishment in cases that did not demand death. Torture was prescribed principally for examining witnesses and punishing perjurers.<sup>96</sup> But there is room to question the widely accepted view that bodily torture was almost never used against heretics.<sup>97</sup> Not only exile, but also torture, was prescribed for anyone who offered injury to a clergyman in church; if such an affront interfered with the divine service, the penalty was death.<sup>98</sup> In his next breath (par. 32, next after par. 31) the lawgiver prescribed "the same penalty" for any who held litanies without the consent of the bishop or who were caught in possession of venerable crosses outside a Catholic Church.<sup>99</sup> Furthermore, the law admitted torture as a prelude to the "extreme penalty."<sup>100</sup>

Justinian decreed it unjust for men who estranged themselves from God to enjoy the privileges extended to the orthodox.<sup>101</sup> Most legal punishments for heresy consisted in depriving heretics of normal rights, which Justinian termed "privileges" (προνόμια). The theory that a fullness of rights is the prerogative only of full citizenship was supposed to be an obsolete feature of the Roman law; for Justinian, by abolishing the ancient categories of *Romani*, *Latini*, and *dediticii*, had professed to extend a single undiminished citizenship to all his subjects.<sup>101b</sup> But this was mere

<sup>94</sup> Nov. 134,13.

<sup>95</sup> Nov. 13,6.

<sup>96</sup> Nov. 90, 1,1, «ἡ ἐκ τῶν βασάνων πείρα»; 123,20 «βασάνοις ὑποβάλλεσθαι».

<sup>97</sup> Cf. Alivisatos 31 seq. & 38.

<sup>98</sup> Nov. 123,31.

<sup>99</sup> Nov. 123,32.

<sup>100</sup> Nov. 134,13 in the light of section 12 (of Nov. 134) : CIC 3, 688,3-4.

<sup>101</sup> Nov. 109,1.

<sup>101b</sup> See *Institutiones Iustiniani* 1,5,3 in CIC 1,2; cf. Cod. 7,5-6.

theory; for his legislation against heresy preserved in practice the ancient Roman principle of inequality. The orthodox constituted the *new class*; for some legal incapacity or forthright penalty circumscribed every non-Catholic. Moreover, what consolation was it to the non-Catholic that his penalty was theoretically negative rather than positive? Just as the ancient Roman under an interdiction of fire and water was banished as effectively as if he had been beaten off with clubs, even so the heretic who could not follow his occupation was made just as hungry as if bread had been snatched from his mouth.

For convenience of treatment, I shall take up anti-heretical measures in two parts: 1st, those dissuasions of heretics that are primarily concerned with the individual in his civil capacities; 2nd, those prohibitions whose immediate goal was to paralyze or to eliminate the religious activities of individuals and groups.

Most of Justinian's enactments against heresy merely revived earlier laws that had fallen into disuse. But some of these laws had been so long forgotten that they were regarded as his original inventions.<sup>102</sup> In a constitution issued jointly with Justin in a. 527, he boasted:

Nevertheless, this point of law would appear to be our very own, because we have appropriated and not ignored (as was formerly done) that which was neglected by some and merely lay couched in writing. For nothing should be regarded as belonging so much to its original authors as to those who have made the best use of what those authors have devised.<sup>103</sup>

He had an insatiable desire to render effective every law that had not been superseded and to supersede every law that he could not render effective.

There was a period of respite before a. 527 in which heretics of all kinds, even Manichaeans, had been permitted both to congregate and to identify themselves; but when they began to appear within the ranks of the military and civil service (στρατεῖαι : *militia*), a privilege of which they had been deprived by earlier enactments, the coregents fulminated against them, ordered a universal purge ("driving away": ἀπελαύνεσθαι), and proscribed Manichaeans and their like to death; but other heretics who were

<sup>102</sup> Proc. HA 11,15.

<sup>103</sup> Cod. 1,5,12,12.

already among the lowest ranks (*cobortales*) were allowed to remain there without any opportunity for advancement or advantage of legal rights; and their children were consigned to the same status.<sup>104</sup> Heretics, with few exceptions, were dismissed from the government payroll and from liberal professions.<sup>105</sup> It was enough for them to live. Applicants for military or governmental positions had to swear to their orthodoxy over the Scriptures and before three witnesses. They must not have received any baptism after having received Catholic baptism.<sup>106</sup> Excessive fines were set for any government officials who might recruit such persons: 50 lbs. of gold for a provincial governor, 30 for a recruiting officer, 8 for a mere registrar.<sup>107</sup>

The Goths must have served the military needs of Justinian better than other heretics, for an exception was made in their case on the pretext that their experiences earlier in life had not educated them to orthodoxy; they could enlist in the *foederati*, even as officers.<sup>108</sup> But Manichaeans were so hated that, if their presence within the ranks were not exposed by the orthodox who knew of them, the orthodox themselves would be punished.<sup>109</sup> An expanded version of this threat was later issued, so that for each unexposed pagan, Samaritan or Manichaean even within governmental office staffs or bureaus, administrators were fined 30 pounds of gold and lower ranks 20 pounds.<sup>110</sup> Furthermore, if an administrator uncovered a heretic, but failed to exact a penalty commensurate to the case, the Count of the Privy Purse was commanded to exact it of the administrator; and, if the Count failed, he was fined 50 pounds of gold and the Palatines of his bureau subjected to corporal punishment.<sup>111</sup>

Among the liberal professions, non-Catholics were expressly debarred from practicing law; Justinian reasoned that, since lawyers earned their livelihood by expressing themselves, it was essen-

---

<sup>104</sup> CTh 16,5,25,1; 16,5,29; 16,5,65,3 : Cod. 1,5,5,3; NTh 3,6; Cod. 1,5,12,pr.-3.6.

<sup>105</sup> Cod. 1,5,12,18.

<sup>106</sup> Cod. 1,4,20; Nov. 37,6.

<sup>107</sup> Cod. 1,5,12,13-15.

<sup>108</sup> Cod. 1,5,12,17.

<sup>109</sup> Cod. 1,5,16,1.

<sup>110</sup> Cod. 1,5,18,10.

<sup>111</sup> Cod. 1,5,18,11.

tial that they have a correct conception of theology.<sup>112</sup> The teaching profession was also closed to them, lest in that capacity their error seduce simple souls.<sup>113</sup>

Therefore, only the most menial occupations were available to non-Catholics. As *curiales* they were bound to perform all the customary public services but received none of the curial privileges (e.g. exemption from flogging).<sup>114</sup>

The *orthodox* children of heretics, Jews and Samaritans were made successors to the estates of their parents as in a case of intestacy, no matter what the last will of their parents expressed. This was justified as a preventive against their being pressured into error by the last will of their parents. In the absence of orthodox children, the property fell to the Fisc.<sup>115</sup> In the case of Nestorians on the one hand and Acephali on the other, Catholic relatives, as well as children, were named as legitimate successors. Children who later repented might thereafter claim their portions, but not its fruit, from the time of their parents' decease. Among the 14 justifiable causes for excluding children from an inheritance as ingrates was failure to receive communion from the Catholic Church.<sup>116</sup> Children were also excused from remembering non-Catholic parents in their wills, on the grounds of ingratitude.<sup>117</sup>

The obvious temptation that such rules posed to dissenters with children of mixed faith was that such parents, while living, might neglect their Catholic children. Justinian therefore demanded support for such children commensurate to the strength of the resources of the parent; daughters had to receive their dowries and sons their nuptial gifts — but only in order to marry orthodox spouses.<sup>118</sup>

Not only inheritance, but every legal means of acquiring property from a Catholic family head, was closed to a heretical wife or child; a heretical child could not even acquire property from his mother; property so transferred, even as a gift (*donatio*), was

<sup>112</sup> Cod. 1,5,12,8-9.

<sup>113</sup> Cod. 1,5,18,4. "Simplicity" was used of rustic illiteracy, which was so widespread that some laws were valid only in cities.

<sup>114</sup> Cod. 1,5,12; Nov. 45,pr.

<sup>115</sup> Cod. 1,5,13; 1,5,19,pr.2.

<sup>116</sup> Nov. 115,3,14.

<sup>117</sup> Nov. 115,4,8; reaffirmed in a. 543 by Nov. 118,6.

<sup>118</sup> Cod. 1,5,12,18-20; 1,5,19,3.

claimed by the public treasury. A heretical widow was even denied the usual rights in the disposition of her dowry; for example, she was not preferred to creditors in recovering her dowry from the estate of the deceased.<sup>119</sup> Local clergymen were instructed to judge of her orthodoxy by watching her attendance at communion.<sup>120</sup>

Non-Catholics were forbidden to buy, sell or own slaves; anyone of them caught in the possession of a slave was fined thirty pounds of gold and the slave was freed.<sup>121</sup>

Heretics could not acquire ownership or control over even privately owned real estate by any kind of contract; for example, if a heretic was caught renting a house, he was expelled and his personal belongings were confiscated by the public treasury; if the landlord knew that his tenant was a heretic, all payments were vindicated by the local church.<sup>122</sup> Of course, if a heretic bought, rented or leased church property, he lost his payments and the church vindicated the property.<sup>123</sup> In the light of such decrees one can appreciate the claim of the *Secret History* that Justinian gave the priests the right to plunder their neighbors.<sup>124</sup> *Dominium* and *commercium* were the privileges of orthodoxy and the priests were the judges of orthodoxy. Our sources assert that among the venerable houses of the Church at Constantinople were some that had belonged to dissenters.<sup>125</sup>

The Church was also licensed to collect taxes from heretics.<sup>126</sup>

No dissenter (not even a *Jew* says the text) could testify against a Catholic in any suit at law. Their testimony was generally admitted in suits to which no Catholics were parties; but those dissenters most detestable to Justinian (i.e., Manichaeans, Borborites, pagans, Samaritans, Montanists, Tascodrugi, and Ophites) were completely debarred from witnessing in court.<sup>127</sup>

Along with murderers and abductors of maidens, those who

<sup>119</sup> Cod. 1,5,18,5-9.

<sup>120</sup> Cod. 8,17,12; Nov. 109.

<sup>121</sup> Cod. 1,5,20,6; 1,10,2.

<sup>122</sup> Nov. 131,14,3.

<sup>123</sup> Nov. 131,14.

<sup>124</sup> Proc. HA 13,4-5.

<sup>125</sup> Nov. 43,pr. : CIC 3,270,25.

<sup>126</sup> Nov. 43,1 : CIC 3,271,11.

<sup>127</sup> Cod. 1,5,21; Nov. 45,1.



"violated the Christian faith" were denied the right of asylum.<sup>128</sup> They were also forbidden to have shops or to do business within the holy enclosures.<sup>129</sup>

Many of Justinian's restrictions on religious activity were designed to prevent either conversion or reversion to a dissenting sect. As in earlier laws, anabaptism was forbidden under penalty of death for both the baptizer and the baptized. Anyone who might induce or lead any member of his household to such a ceremony was fined ten pounds of gold and exiled.<sup>130</sup>

In November of 530 Justinian aired his vexation at the fact that dissenters were still holding assemblies, appointing leaders, and performing baptisms. He warned proprietors that they would lose any property on which the assemblies of non-conformists were held. Their leaders were ordered expelled.<sup>131</sup> The later banishment of Anthimus, the patriarch, and Severus the virtual *κεφαλὴ* of the *ἀκέφαλοι* is noteworthy as illustrating the manner of expulsion desired. They were forbidden to live in any prominent city, to proselytize, to teach, or even to communicate with anyone. The intended form of exile is even more vividly described in the case of Peter of Apameia:

banished as far from home as can be, and hiding himself, he shall imitate the life of those whose error he has followed; for it is more profitable for such men to be hidden than to be seen. In obscurity they injure only themselves, but when they are in the public eye, their doctrines furnish an occasion of destruction to the simple; it is by no means just that the King (or, Emperor) allow this to happen to the Christian flock of God or right-minded people.

Any who fed these men in their exile were warned that they would see their homes claimed by the Church.<sup>132</sup>

In Africa Arians, Donatists and Jews were under prohibitions like those laid down for pagans. They were forbidden to hold communion or congregational services, to possess holy things or temples, to appoint leaders, to proselyte or to baptize.<sup>133</sup> The

---

<sup>128</sup> Nov. 37,10.

<sup>129</sup> Cod. 1,5,20,2.4.

<sup>130</sup> Cod. 1,6,2-3.

<sup>131</sup> Cod. 1,5,20,2-3,5.

<sup>132</sup> Nov. 42.

scope of these strictures on religion in Africa suggests that under its previous rulers non-Arian brands of Christianity and other religions, even paganism, had enjoyed a freedom that Justinian sought to suppress. The rule of the Vandals there, like that of Theodoric in Italy, must have been far more enlightened and liberal than that of Byzantium. Cassiodorus has preserved the following enlightened comment of Theodoric:

We are unable to issue orders touching religion, because no man is led by compulsion to adopt a belief against his will.<sup>134</sup> Nevertheless, Vandal kings, like Catholic kings, were individually different. Evagrius told of orthodox martyrs whose tongues Huneric cut out by the roots and Procopius has recorded that Trasamandus was unlike his predecessors; for he tried to persuade Catholics to change their faith with blandishments, whereas his predecessors had used torture.<sup>135</sup>

The laws of Justinian had driven non-Catholics to the secret exercise of religion; he proceeded to eradicate even this. No form of service but prayer was allowed in a private home, and even for prayer the local prelate had to authorize any clergyman who might be involved. After three months the houses of violators were confiscated.<sup>136</sup> A later enactment designated the local church, rather than the public treasury, as vindicator of property on which a liturgy had been celebrated without clergy subject to the local bishop. But if the owner did not know of it, the occupants were expelled and their personal belongings vindicated by the church.<sup>137</sup> The use of crosses was restricted to sacred places and laymen were forbidden to offer litanies.<sup>138</sup> The reason why no church could be built unless the bishop at the head of a procession had prayed and planted a cross was to prevent would-be founders from "pandering to their own diseases" by erecting, not orthodox churches, but "irregular beastly lairs."<sup>139</sup> A ramification of this figure is insinuated in the imperial ban on fellowship

---

<sup>133</sup> Nov. 37,5,8.

<sup>134</sup> Cassiodorus, *Variae* 2,27: "Religionem imperare non possumus, quia nemo cogitur ut credat invitus." Procopius, BG 5,1,32-39 regards the cases of Symmachus and Boethius as exceptional.

<sup>135</sup> Proc. BV (= *Bellum Vandalicum*) 3,8,8-10; Evagrius 4,14.

<sup>136</sup> Nov. 58: ἁγιστεία, λατρεία, λειτουργία, μυσταγωγία.

<sup>137</sup> Nov. 131,8.

<sup>138</sup> Nov. 123,32.

<sup>139</sup> Nov. 67,1; 131,14,2; 37,8 speluncae.

dinners (συνπόσια; συσσίτια); this form of assembly was counted a menace; for participants would lie in wait to spring upon (θηγεύειν) the souls of naive persons.<sup>140</sup> The builder of a church had to clear his appointees for its clergy with the patriarch.<sup>141</sup>

Any new churches built by heretics or synagogues built by Jews were legally vindicated to the ownership of the local church.<sup>142</sup>

Books like those of Nestorius, Porphyry or Severus, whom Justinian deposed, were burned. Calligraphers or tachygraphers who copied them would see the guilty hand severed. Manichaean books were consigned to the flames.<sup>143</sup>

We have summarized the laws on the subject at hand. The question remains: Were these laws put into effect?

As early as a. 535 Justinian took credit for having won to orthodoxy a numerous multitude of heretics:

Since, by the grace of our Great God and Savior Jesus Christ and yet by our labor and encouragement a great number of former heretics has been brought over (προσαχθέντος : *deductae*) to the Most Holy Great Church, we must double the original quota of ministers, in order to perform the pious liturgy.<sup>144</sup>

The words of the law suggest the figure of hostile forces in battle that had been induced to change sides, or even captured. Perhaps such a metaphorical inference is justified, for there are other passages that describe the conflict with heresy in martial terms. Justinian spoke of Severus of Theopolis as waging an "undeclared war" on the church.<sup>145</sup>

In a. 537 Justinian set forth another claim in the following words:

Our commonwealth is both rectified and already full of the correct faith, with every other tenet (heresy) reasonably despised.<sup>146</sup>

<sup>140</sup> Cod. 1,5,20,5.

<sup>141</sup> Nov. 57,2.

<sup>142</sup> Nov. 131,14,2.

<sup>143</sup> Nov. 42,1,2; Cod. 1,5,16,3.

<sup>144</sup> Nov. 3,1 : CIC 3,20,40.

<sup>145</sup> «πόλεμος ἀκήρυκτος.» Nov. 42,1,1.

<sup>146</sup> Nov. 45,1. The translation is unavoidably inadequate: τὸ γὰρ πολίτευμα τὸ ἡμέτερον ὀρθὸν τέ ἐστι καὶ ἤδη μεστὸν τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως, πάσης αἰρέσεως ἄλλης εἰκότως μεμνημένης.» Cf., in connection with civil

We have sampled that labor and encouragement, or insistence (προτροπαί) by which he claimed to have won over heretics. What of those who were not won over? What were the numbers and what was the destiny of those who chose to be deprived of "human benefits" rather than "to worship God properly"?<sup>147</sup> The *Secret History* claims that so many were driven from their occupations that normal economic life was disrupted.<sup>148</sup> Is this true or is it the invention of a detractor? It is corroborated by the laws; for when Justin II in a Novel revived the testamentary and commercial penalties against Samaritans, which Justinian had first enacted and then suspended, he exempted farmers, because of the damage that it might do to the revenue of the state. This sounds as though the state had learned an economic lesson.<sup>149</sup>

The *Secret History* also observed that Justinian did not count it murder to kill men of a different faith, that many inquisitors went abroad to compel men to orthodoxy, and that therefore the empire was full of slaughter and exiles.<sup>150</sup> In the light of the legal sources I find the *Secret History* credible in this portrayal.

The objection may be raised that, since Justinian often protested regarding the failure of officials to observe his decrees, his religious enactments could also have been neglected. In some instances they were,<sup>151</sup> but that they were totally or lastingly neglected is untenable, because both Justinian himself and later emperors witness their effect in later enactments. For example, Sergius, Bishop of Caesarea was said to have interceded for the Samaritans.

Although the *Secret History* is extreme in its criticism, its portrayal of the miseries of the persecuted is the very picture that one would expect to result from the extant laws. When, in a. 537 he berated the praetorian prefect because he had not already ripped away (διέσπασεν : *dilacerasti*) the hated Montanists from their status, his tone adds credence to the narrative of the *Secret History* that a desperate group of them had entered a shrine with their

---

injustice, Nov. 88,pr.: «πολίτευμα μεστὸν μὲν ἑλλειμμάτων . . . μεστὸν δὲ πάσης ἀδικίας.»

<sup>147</sup> Cod. 1,5,12,5.

<sup>148</sup> Proc. HA 11,19-20.

<sup>149</sup> Nov. 144.

<sup>150</sup> Proc. HA 11,21-33; 13,7.

<sup>151</sup> Nov. 52,pr.; 95; Cod. 1,49.

wives and children, and had burned it over their own heads.<sup>152</sup>

On psychological and ecological grounds it would seem reasonable that, if the laws that we have delineated were enforced, those who refused to capitulate would suffer an increase in spirituality, in misery, or in both.

What was the depth of conversion of those whom Justinian did win over? The *Secret History* reports what we would expect: that many adopted the name of Christian in order to rid themselves of danger.<sup>153</sup> That the empire was not only full of slaughter and exiles, but also full of dissemblers, is verified by the desperate efforts of Justinian to trap the insincere; such enactments as the following give vent to his frustration at merely nominal conversions: If a professedly orthodox person, who had been a Manichaean should be detected even in a random chat with a known Manichaean, and should fail to report him to the authorities, his Catholicism was assumed to be a pretense, and he was put to death as a Manichaean.<sup>154</sup> Any reputedly orthodox man whose wife or children were caught in heresy, and who did not train them to orthodoxy was treated by the law as a dissembler.<sup>155</sup> The clergy carefully observed attendance at communion in order to trap suspects.<sup>156</sup>

When Procopius deprecates the attempts of Justinian to compel his subjects to follow his own standards of morality, his subjectivity is an obstacle to wholehearted acceptance; such narratives as that of the wretched females who preferred suicide to Theodora's monastic reformatory are viewed with suspicion because of his other exaggerations.<sup>157</sup> But the view that Justinian was unrealistic and visionary in the approach that he took to matters of human behavior is supported by sources that are free from invective, and even complimentary to him. Justin II, for example, asserted that Justinian I had surpassed all others in piety and sobriety. But this was said in order to mitigate the abrogation of one of Justinian's novels; for Justin said this as he rescinded Novel 117,8 on marriage. The latter protested that he did not really *want* to restore divorce by mutual consent, but he complained

<sup>152</sup> Nov. 45,pr.; Proc. HA 11,23.

<sup>153</sup> Proc. HA 11,25.

<sup>154</sup> Cod. 1,5,16.

<sup>155</sup> Cod. 1,5,18,5.

<sup>156</sup> Nov. 109,1.

<sup>157</sup> Proc. HA 17,5-6; aed. 1,5,25; 1,9,3.

that, in spite of his own threats and pleas, warfare complete with ambushes and poisoning was waged in many a home.<sup>158</sup>

Furthermore, with regard to Justinian's visionary tendencies the historian of his wars was probably qualified to testify to the causes of imperial military failures. He felt that preoccupation with theology proved a hindrance to his success; the paralysis of campaigns was attributed to the monarch's speculation on divinity.<sup>159</sup>

Justinian propounded the maxim "nothing without measure (*ἐν ᾤμετρίᾳ*) is good"; but he was oblivious to this very maxim in religious matters; for in another law he stated, "the best measure for endowing the Church is measurelessness (*ᾤμετρία*)."<sup>160</sup>

In his dogmatic composition (*λόγος*) against the monophysite heresy, Justinian used a metaphor modelled on that of Jesus in which the enemies of the gospel are represented as tares (*ζιζάνια* : "darnel"); he described heretics as "the enemies of piety who retain the devil's dissemination of tares and are unwilling to follow the good seed . . ." <sup>161</sup> It is striking that Justinian would allude to that very parable which constitutes a powerful antidote to the premature and forcible extraction of the diabolical seed; for, in the parable, when the servants inform their master that they have detected weeds mingled with his planting, the Master replies, "An enemy has done this." Their response is an anxious request: "Shall we gather them out?" Whereupon the Master insists, "No. You may uproot the good with the bad. Let them grow together until the harvest."<sup>162</sup>

Such advice seems to me as a layman far clearer than the abstruse points of Christology in which Justinian professed expertise. According to the parable, he usurped the function assigned to the angels of God at the consummation of the age.

\* \* \*

This paper is respectfully and gratefully dedicated to a cultivated gentleman whose active career has been of inestimable value to the progress of scholarship — Mr. Isham Perkins.

<sup>158</sup> Nov. 140 (a. 566).

<sup>159</sup> Proc. HA 18,29.

<sup>160</sup> Nov. 3,pr.; 7,2,1 : CIC 3,53,23; cf. Nov. 133,pr. of his own legislation he says «οὐ μέτρια νενομοθέτηται»!

<sup>161</sup> MPG 86/1, 1145B.

<sup>162</sup> Mt. 13,18-20; cf. 13,49-50.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

indeed are quite successful.

The theological meaning expressed in the chanted hymns; the clarity of the measures of the Byzantine scale in all its three γένη; the power and richness of the mode; and the successful participation of each of the members — all create the proper atmosphere genuine to the spirit of Ecclesiastical Byzantine Music.

Also, the intricate fluctuation of the Byzantine melody and magnificent change in γένη, demand ὁμοιογένειαν and talented voices in order to accomplish the result which is sought. The requirement, however difficult in many respects, is met quite satisfactorily by both of the Byzantine choirs whose effort will undoubtedly be crowned with success.

SAVVAS I. SAVVAS  
Hellenic College

MICHAEL KEELING, *Morals in a Free Society* (New York: Seabury Press, 1968), pp. 157. \$3.50.

Michael Keeling is an English Clergyman who has written a little book in which he seeks to meet the moral issues of our time. He divides his work into two disanalogous parts. The first of "Theoretical Considerations" makes up one third of the bulk of the book, and the second of "Practical Applications" makes up the balance.

In the first part the author discusses the meaning of moral statements, the sources of Christian moral judgments and the nature of human responsibility. For one involved in the teaching of Christian Ethics, the paucity of theoretical topics is immediately felt. However, those which are treated are done with an honest attempt to communicate in understandable terms the author's thinking on the problems raised. On the first problem, he avoids simplistic answers in reference to the question of the nature of ethical statements. He opts for an institutionalist approach based on the intuitive apprehension of "the fitness or harmony of actions with our own nature and that of the whole world." (p. 18) In spite of this, he pushes strongly for an autonomous ethic based on personal perception rather than any form of objective moral approach. In a circuitous manner he seems to arrive at some kind of subjectivism informed by intuition based on some concept of the nature of God's world. The coherency and cogency of this approach is in some doubt.

In the second chapter in theoretical matters he deals with reason and belief. (He relies on the present work of the Spirit rather than on particular formulations of belief; this is seen as being even more open-minded than the philosophical rationalist position). He treats also of the Bible, Natural Law, Conscience and, of interest to the Orthodox reader, "The Mind of the Church" in which the conciliar idea of the Orthodox Church (Sobornost) is applied to the totality of the whole community of Christians. The Orthodox cannot, however, be pleased with this truncated appropriation of part of the doctrine which leaves out the historical di-



mension and the recognition that Christian truth is both historically valid and existentially present; Sobornost includes the twenty centuries of Christian tradition also. In the third basic Theoretical issue discussed, that of human responsibility, the author, after a discussion of the contribution of the behavioral and social sciences, concludes with a position of limited responsibility. For the Christian it is "not a question of finding a chink for personal responsibility between the findings of sociology, biology, and psychology, but of learning, by power given and received, to take control of what we are." (p. 45) "The Christian finds that in committing himself to God he is freer than ever before, because for the first time he begins to discover who he is and what he wants." (p. 49) This, perhaps, is the most satisfying chapter in the whole book. If followed to its logical conclusion it would also radically change the presentation of the meaning of Moral Statements.

Part Two, "Practical Applications," is developed through a multitude of practical examples taken from current English life. This disadvantage from the point of view of the American reader is in part overcome by a special preface, but also by the fact that after a short while the affinity between the two national cultures comes to the surface and the American reader nods sympathetically recognizing the same problems which he faces, only sketched in different colors.

Law seems to be treated in a rather positivistic and emotive manner. One wonders what happened to the treatment of natural law and why we have no further application here? The approach to criminal law emphasizes individual rights at the expense of "society." The sense of the power of individual sinfulness seems to be lacking while "the qualities of thrustingness, acquisitiveness and competitiveness which seem to characterize individualist approaches are condemned. The liberal emphasis on rights with a de-emphasis on duty without the sense of society seems to me to cultivate these very characteristics which are now pronounced as not desirable.

In the section entitled "The Right to Life," he argues strongly for the truth that disablement does not eliminate the worth of living. The fact that a person is burdened with a physical or mental disability does, of course, limit the range of experience of even the most disabled person within its context is intrinsically valuable and therefore the right to life of the disabled individual is morally unassailable. Thus, Euthanasia is severely restricted in this treatment. This influences his discussion of abortion and Euthanasia. He, however, opts for the right of the couple to choose abortion under legal control basing his argument on the non-personhood of the foetus.

The discussion of the relationship of the family and sex ethics uses a great deal of behavioral and social supportive material. On the question of pre-marital sex there is the frequently made differentia between sexual relations between engaged persons and promiscuity. This is based on the western idea of marriage as mutual profession of intent. But contrary to much of this, the place of the marriage ceremony is emphasized also by the author. The Orthodox concept of the Marriage Sacrament as the grant-

ing of blessing and grace for the marital status of Christians precludes the bifurcation of promiscuity and pre-marital sexual experience as radically different. This again comes into consideration on the discussion on divorce. Homosexuality is treated in the light of the Wolfendon Report. One wonders what St. Paul would retort to the question posed as to whether it is "logically impossible to ask for the grace of God to use a homosexual relationship as a means of growing in the love of God." (p. 97)

It is in his treatment of "Economic Man" that a complete breakdown of the sharp division between the individual and society becomes most evident. The meaning of work as a contribution to society and the criticism of *laissez-faire* rejection of Unions in the name of individual freedom sufficiently refute the notion of the non-existence of "society." The author very sympathetically and quite positively deals with the problems of poverty, race relations, and educational opportunity as parts of the problem of inequality.

The book ends with a fairly extensive bibliography.

Though not in any sense an ethics text, the book has taken into account some of the major areas of theoretical and practical ethical concern. The strength and at once weakness of the book is its dependence on psychological and sociological research. The relevance thus gained seems to have been used at the expense of the normative character of the lethica discipline. In all, a useful contribution.

STANLEY S. HARAKAS  
*Hellenic College*

DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS, *The Greek Orthodox Church: Faith, History and Practice* (New York: Seabury Press, 1967), pp. 127. Hardbound \$3.50, paperback \$1.95.

Fr. Demetrios Constantelos, a distinguished cleric of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, was educated in the Theological School of this Archdiocese, pursued advanced studies leading to a Ph.D. in Byzantine History (Rutgers) and subsequently returned to his *alma mater* as Professor of History. Through his writings, especially in the field of Byzantine Studies, Fr. Constantelos is becoming widely known among American as well as international scholarly circles.

His work, *The Greek Orthodox Church: Faith, History and Practice*, belongs properly to the field of General Ecclesiastical History. The work, according to the author, is an exposition of the central teachings and the ethos of the Orthodox Church, rather than a theological treatise, and is directed primarily to the educated layman. Its contents bear the following structure: Foreword by Archbishop Iakovos, pp. 3-4; author's preface, pp. 7-8; table of contents, p. 9; introduction, pp. 11-13; chapter one: The Name of the Church, pp. 17-30; chapter two: The Historical Development of the Church, pp. 31-62; chapter three: The Faith of the Church,

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

# NEGLECTED FACTORS INFLUENCING UNITY

By EMILIANOS TIMIADIS

Metropolitan of Calabria

## INTRODUCTION

In Christianity the paradox lies in the fact that, although all Churches confess the same Lord and hold the same Scriptures, they present such a diversity of doctrine. Unless one takes into account certain constituent underlying relative factors, it is impossible to understand the diversity in the confessional reality of our common faith due to history, challenging all believers today to work for the restoration of Unity.

Psychology and personal approach can act in an ambivalent direction: they can become causes for reunion as for disunion. They can unmercifully militate against the ultimate oneness. How can this variety be placed at the service of our divisions? For centuries they spread confusion in our relations to such a point that one might think that they are all alike.

## NEGLECTED FACTORS INFLUENCING UNITY

These factors, influenced to a certain degree by certain sociological, cultural, and linguistic conditions, very often resulted in different interpretations becoming crystallised in different confessional groups. A doctrine was formulated in terms which were often inaccessible or open to misunderstanding in another language. Whether theological or non-theological, these factors divide the one message of Christ into a variety of doctrinal positions and theological interpretations. In these days, where hearts are closer and the imperative need for reconciliation is prevailing more and more, it is our duty to detect these factors so that dialogue becomes easier.

Differences occurred not just because of persistent ill-intentioned heretics. We must not forget the non-theological obstacles that determined our theological formulas and positions. These must be constantly born in mind in order to make one's views clear. There is a dictum of Terentius Publius about two brothers who, although using the same words, finally quarrel because they understand different things: 'Duo cum faciunt idem, saepe non est idem.'<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In his comedy *Adelphoi*, V, I, 37.

This dictum is illustrated again and again during theological debates and controversial discussions in the Church's history. Therefore, when our confessional families endeavour to reach a realistic understanding and to heal the main cause of their divergences, they must examine the many aspects of those factors which cause disunity. In the following pages we present an Orthodox contribution, the purpose of which is entirely objective.

### *Inadequacies of Doctrinal Formulations*

The Church is not an external organization, a corporation consisting of a number of local communities within a more general and abstract collectivity. 'The Church,' as St. Antony the Great of Egypt (251-356) puts it, 'is the house of Truth,' This Truth is Christ, the eternal Logos; and the Church, by virtue of its participation in the life of Christ, the eternal Logos, is the 'body of Christ.' The body of Christ is one, and therefore the Church is one. It is, from the Christian point of view, as impossible to have more than one Church as it is to have more than one body of Christ. When, in the twelfth century, Bruno of Asti (1048), a great champion of free theological expression and Abbot of Monte Cassino, wrote to the Benedictines of Constantinople to warn them against the 'soft persuasion' and 'furious elocution' of the 'bishop (i.e. the Patriarch) of the diocese and his clergy,' who had asked them 'Is Christ divided in His body, that He is one in the sacrifice at Rome and another in the sacrifice at Constantinople?' it was precisely this essential unity of the Church that he pointed out: 'But we truly hold, and from the heart firmly believe, that although the customs of the churches are different, nevertheless there is one faith, indissolubly united to the head, that is Christ, and He Himself is one and remains the same in His body.'

From the intellectual point of view, the breach between the Latins and Greeks arose from the fact that each side came to regard as absolute and irreconcilable certain differing representations, differing mental images, of the Truth. This in its turn led to different dogmatic formulations and hence to rival concepts of ecclesiastical organization and authority. But to understand how this happened, something must be said on the whole question of the formulation of Christian doctrine in dogmatic terms.

A formulation of the Truth, a doctrinal formulation, is valid, not because it provides, for those capable of receiving it, a mental

form through which a ray of this Truth is communicated to man; it thus provides an indispensable support whereby the individual may approach the Reality of which it is the expression. One might say that just as the Incarnation of the eternal Logos in the life and actions of the historical Christ is a condescension of the Divinity towards human obscurity, through which are revealed 'things hidden from the foundation of the world,' so the same Logos, the Truth itself, condescends also to become 'incarnate' in religious forms and dogmas which serve man as a guide through the maze of confusion and ignorance in which he finds himself.

In other words, doctrinal formulations have a double aspect. On the one hand, they 'reveal' the Truth in terms accessible to the human intelligence, and to this extent have an affirmative or cataphatic aspect, serving both as supports for man in his spiritual realization, and as defences against misconceptions of things which the human intelligence may be tempted to make. On the other hand, they are not the Truth itself, but merely its expression in human terms, and in this respect they have a negative, or apophatic, aspect. This double aspect of all doctrinal formulations was well understood by the Fathers of the Church; it was precisely a desire to avoid errors which might arise from confusing human expressions of the Truth with the Truth itself that led them to speak of the ultimate nature of God in such terms as 'Non-Being,' or 'Super essentiality,' and therefore as beyond the capacity of the human intelligence to define.

Moreover — and this is the second point of importance in this context — the way in which the Truth is expressed or (from the human point of view) envisaged depends to a certain extent on the particular time and place, the particular milieu, in which that expression is made.<sup>2</sup> One might liken the Truth to the sun, each of whose rays is identical, but each of which will penetrate the object it strikes according to the varying degrees of capacity and receptivity in the objects themselves. One of the rays, penetrating a green medium, appears to that medium to be green, while to a red medium it appears red. The differences, which may appear absolute to the mediums themselves, are, in fact, merely relative, depending not on any difference between the

---

<sup>2</sup> On language's inadequacy as cause of mistrust between East and West see Gregory of Nazianzus' *Sermon* 21, 35; P.G. 35, 1124 — *Sermon* 32, 3; P.G. 37, 176.

actual rays, but only on the limitations of the two mediums receiving them. Certainly, one medium may be less resistant than another, and hence the way it reflects the ray striking it may correspond more accurately to the actual nature of that ray than the reflection of another medium, which is denser. But such a superiority of reflection is again relative, not absolute, and in any case does not preclude the more imperfect reflection.

This work of adaptation was carried out by the Ecumenical Councils. These Councils, in order to supply the formal structure of the religion now to serve as the integrator of the imperial world, formulated certain 'minimum' definitions of the Christian doctrine, definitions that were to be the criteria of orthodoxy and as such binding upon, and therefore readily accessible to all members of society. That this adaptation of Christian doctrine, and indeed the whole assumption by the Church of an 'official' esoteric role, was necessary and providential becomes clear when it is considered that, with the break-up of the old Roman Empire and the virtual disappearance of ancient traditions and élites, the West was threatened with total disintegration, and that it was only this action of the Church which prevented this from taking place.

What happened was, first, that in adopting Christianity as the 'ideological' basis upon which the unity and the cohesion of society were to depend, the state was now concerned that all members of that society should be 'those of the Way'; second, in order that this might be so, the Church was compelled to define certain aspects of doctrine in terms sufficiently general, simplified, and uniform to serve as a kind of standard 'confession of faith' for the average citizen, quite apart from whether he or she had the capacity to experience the Reality of which they are only the formal expression.

Second, the fact that aspects of Christian doctrine were now codified in forms which were binding upon, and therefore mentally accessible to, individuals regardless of the capacity of these latter to experience the Truth which they express, exposed the doctrine in a new and dangerous degree to what may be described as the infiltrations of the philosophical mentality.

The second factor which tended to expose Christian dogma to a one-sided, exclusive, and philosophical attitude is that, as defined by the Ecumenical Councils, it was directed specifically against heresies. It was defined in what one might call a polemic and defensive style, a spirit of aggression. Or, to put it another way:

on the one hand, these Conciliar definitions were made to protect the faith, and the nature and meaning of the Mysteries, from misconceptions; they possess, therefore, in relation to the Mysteries themselves, an essentially relative and apophatic character. But, on the other hand, these definitions were made in the face of, and to attack, heretical misconceptions, and here they possess an absolute and positive character, one which, moreover, was supported and imposed by the State, at whose instigation, and in whose interests, they had in any case to a certain extent been framed.

The sphere of doctrine, therefore, to which the definitions of the Councils apply is precisely the sphere concerned with the divine-human relationships, on the proper understanding of which the believer's full realization of the reality of the Mysteries depends. These relationships are existential relationships: they are the relations of God (considered as Creator, the principle of being), to what He creates, and above all to man — or, which is the same thing, they are the relationships of the divine economy as revealed in the Incarnation and perpetuated in the Mysteries.

The foregoing considerations help to explain why, once differences in the representation of the Truth, leading to differing dogmatic formulations, had arisen in the Latin and Greek medieval world, these formulations appeared irreconcilable to the point of producing a breach in Christendom. For the reasons at which we have been glancing, each side tended to regard its own position not from the point of view of the Truth itself, to which it is strictly relative, but solely from the formal, 'exterior,' point of view, in which it appears as absolute, and to exclude any other position which conflicts with it, either in wording or in form.

Although semantics played a great part in defining one's faith and resulted in estranged interpretation, we have to admit that not a few doctrines in antiquity were so closely related and so linked up with certain terminology that it almost became identified with the doctrines themselves, was therefore regarded as sacrosanct. We see this phenomenon in Jewish expressions, taken intact and even today used in our worship; we have not dared to translate them because of reverence.

It is true that a doctrine can be differently interpreted. Nevertheless, its form and wording also have some importance. In formulating a doctrine, some formulations are more appropriate



than others. We must not underestimate formulations and wording. They take deep root in the conscience and the minds of the Christian community. Once people accept certain forms of faith, they confess them, and those forms become part of their inner being, by daily use. In other words, a dogma is not only an expression of Faith, but also, as formulated, a guardian and expression of Faith.

### *Reconciling Forms of Theological Thinking*

A restructuring effort of theological thinking to reach an harmonious understanding is needed, in order to reconcile the Orthodox and Western ways of interpreting our common Christian Faith. During ecumenical discussions and theological confrontations we feel that Western Churches often fail to return to a theology truly grounded in worship and the doxology of redemption; their rationalizing tendency reduces theology to a mere system of concepts.

It can be affirmed that Orthodox theology stands on an existential pneumatology rather than on one that conceives of the Holy Spirit either as passive or less active than the other two Persons of the Holy Trinity. This may seem strange to a Western thinker. Western theology, based mostly on Aristotelian terminology and the scholastic method, tried in the past to rationalise the non-rational, even more, to intellectualise the mystical and to create a 'system' of Christian truths in categories, valid in itself and, so to speak, independent of any devotional or mystical relationship with the Divinity.

It would be an exaggeration to hold that Orthodox theological terminology, because it is not defined and classified in categories, remains ambiguous or obscure, so that terms may have various meanings and be misleading. It is true that the Greek Fathers systematically avoided definitions that were legalistic in approach. It is rather through mystical experience, prayer, contemplation, and fervent seeking that a man is enabled to attain to the truth. Truths are apprehended by experience, by spirituality, by purification, by inner commitment, not by intellectual knowledge. In theology one has to go beyond the act of understanding, and by way of renunciation and deification to attain to the vision of God. In the Western approach theology, no matter how true and sincere be the movement towards harmonising such theology with Patristic thought, none the less the 'intellectus fidei' is always domi-

nant; its dominance was in fact already advocated by Augustine and Anselm and later — in analogous circumstances — by the Reformers.

Let us quote one very controversial example. The 'Filioque' controversy is not merely concerned with the retention or removal of one single ill-conceived word. It has implications covering the whole range of the activity of the Spirit and its place and meaning in the divine economy. The Holy Spirit is not inferior to either of the other two Persons of the Holy Trinity. He is consubstantial with Them, and diffuses all the charismata necessary for man's perfecting, and He does so from the source of his own being. He is worshipped with the Father and the Son, because He is definitely one of the three equal Persons of the Holy Trinity. Western theological activity should not restrict itself to the explanation of scriptural texts and the distinctive features or attributes of Divinity. It must penetrate behind the written expression 'equal' to the Father, to reach the divine in its very activity and being, so as to make articulate the knowledge of divine Truth itself, as it was made manifest for mankind's redemption through the Incarnate Logos and through the Holy Spirit. Theology, then, will not only, or mainly, operate with ideas, but rather will discern the very reality of the Spirit in its inner and dynamic movement.

The Arians fell into the worst error in regard to the Godhead of the Logos because they preferred above all other ways that of 'epinoia,' a method of thinking that was objective and nominalist, while St. Athanasius preferred a way centering on 'dianoia,' a form of thinking which is open to, and determined by divine reality. Accordingly, Athanasius attains to a true objectivity, which has nothing to do with rationalisation, but rather stresses the new data given by the revelation of the Holy Spirit. In short, either one conceives of the Spirit and His actions as mere objects among others, and then one discusses Him and them; or else one submits to the logic of His divine and personal intervention, in order to think in terms of a human-divine encounter, of a realistic encounter with a Person other than oneself, although still veiled from us.

If we pass to the field of worship, what strikes the Westerner present at the Orthodox Liturgy is its diversity. This fact in itself is not surprising, for our Liturgies were not devised by specialists sitting in offices; they grew gradually out of the living experience of different races, nations and cultures, ranging from the Byzan-

tine to those of the Middle East. The resultant combination of freedom and orthodoxy, so that the Liturgy becomes simultaneously the expression of the genius of a people and of its fidelity to the Christian Faith, is one of the great lessons which the West can learn from the East.

This leads us to another consideration. The great and spacious traditions of Orthodoxy developed over centuries, and under political and social conditions that were very different from those under which Western Christianity developed. This in part explains the wide divergence in approach and outlook and temperament which we find today between members of the two different communities, which stem from different cultural backgrounds. A considerable part of our differences is due to the forms of expression given to the Faith that we profess. It is easy to affirm the existence of such obstacles, but it is difficult to assess what weight they carry, for they are inseparable psychological obstacles which seem more important. The latter in fact take priority over the former, and have progressively led to their creation.

Different mentalities intended to complement one another, have slowly become strangers to each other, to such a point that they have become unable to understand one another's languages. We have ceased to feel that we are brothers, or to treat one another as brothers. We have hardened our hearts and our positions in opposition to one another. We have become rigid. We have tried to justify at the ecclesiastical level separations that indeed exist, but which were caused almost exclusively by non-theological factors. Over the centuries this attitude has helped to build up the mentality of Christians in regard to one another; it has developed mistrust, and crystallized theological oppositions.

The truths of Christianity, as revealed in the Bible, had to be formulated, interpreted, and developed, as circumstances demanded. While their essence remained unchanged, their significance and the forms in which they were presented had to be made progressively more intelligible to the masses. Theology has rendered a great service in this domain, for it has made use of every method of communication in order to make the eternal truths understandable to the people.

In this way Christian doctrine, in the course of its interpretation, underwent a certain process of evolution. The definitions of Chalcedon give us great help in the study and better understanding of the Incarnation of the Logos, as set forth in the pro-

logue of St. John's Gospel. The famous Anti-Augustinian St. Vincent of Lérins (450) rightly stated:

Is religion subject to no kind of progress in the Church of Christ? Certainly, there exists a certain type, even a considerable one . . . but on this condition: that this progress should constitute for the Faith a veritable progress (*profectus*), and not an alteration (*permutatio*).<sup>3</sup>

Research into, and the study of, the eternal truths is essential. Not even Theology can escape the law of growth. Dogma, after all, is destined for men, for human nature; hence the characteristics of human nature cannot be ignored. Theology, therefore, has by its very nature as a science to follow this law; namely, it must remain constantly founded on the same doctrinal basis, having always the same meaning (*sensu*) and the same Faith (*sententia*). St. Vincent of Lérins goes on to maintain:

The particularity of this progress lies in the fact that while everything is in growth, it also remains as it is, since the essence of change or alteration is that a certain thing is transformed into another.<sup>4</sup>

### *Diversity in Unity*

It is not a sin to have different rites, but it is a sin not to accept and respect the different linguistic formulations and customs of others. The different parts of the body are different (Christ is the head). Let us look at the diversity of charismata which all conform to the Pauline doctrine. In the human family as a whole the different members of the one body live happily together amid their differences. We are not trying to find one equal level or a uniformity — it is not that which leads the Church to Christ. We have to accept the different gifts which each individual member of the one body can give to that Body.

However, unity of faith, even in its outside appearances, and an organic union does not exclude diversity of rites and disciplinary practices. In those parts which are susceptible to change, faith must be appropriate to the nature of the race, to culture as a whole, and to the varied needs of the times. This is what happened during the first ten centuries of Christianity. Organic and doctrinal unity did not necessarily imply rigid conformity.

<sup>3</sup> 'Commonitorium,' xxiii, 1-3.

<sup>4</sup> 'Commonitorium,' xxiii, 1-3.

Towards the middle of the ninth century, Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in his famous letter addressed to Pope Nicolas I, while expressing Christian principles which implied liberty and union in the various Churches advocating pluralism in worship, said:

When neither faith nor a general decree (pronounced by ecumenical councils) are threatened to be violated, but on the other hand it is a fact that in other Christian lands other ways of life and customs are in force, we are not being just if we say that they are the protectors of customs different from those observed in other Christian countries which are wrong, nor if we claim that they are those who have not accepted the given customs and have thereby transgressed the law.

At the beginning of the thirteenth century, the Greek author and learned Archbishop of Ochris Demetrius Chomatianus wrote as follows:

The causes of schism are not the particular traditions or disciplines of a Church, but the basic issues concerning our Faith.<sup>5</sup>

In Latin theology there is always a dogmatic definition which is precise and clear in truths and disciplines, while in Oriental theology definition tends to be descriptive and pliable, allowing for a certain flexibility in its use. This creates enormous difficulties for an agreement of opinion. However, if we take a closer look at the Conciliar Decrees of the West, we could find points of agreement and the respective points of view could be looked at anew. One could hope that the different interpretations would not definitely prevent oneness in Faith and consensus on the essentials.

Let us take an example from the West: the seventh Canon of the 24th session of the Council of Trent (1563) seems to give an interpretation in favour of the indissolubility of marriage. However, this is purely an outside appearance. The original text does not lead to a doctrine which is a 'doctrina certa,' but is more like a sort of disciplinary regulation — a 'proxima fidei.' The legislators are motivated by several considerations if one assumes this interpretation. The legalised scheme of the O.T. accentu-

---

<sup>5</sup> Canonical Collection of the Sacred Canons 'Syntagma'; by Rallis and Potlis, V, 432.

ates the difference between the two sexes. However, St. Augustine had applied the principle of the moral equality of the sexes and influenced the Roman Canon a great deal. Much later, according to the spirit of the times, the Councils of Spain, Gaul, and the kingdom of France went in the other direction. Indeed Gratian's Decree (1140) and the interpretation of the Augustinian school have followed a strict point of view and this resulted in the forming of a law of the Roman Church.

The difference is still found in Orthodox practice in 'oikonomia,' in compliance, as mentioned often enough by Origen and even St. Basil.

The new ecumenical climate has roused mixed feelings: scepticism, relief, and a sometimes too optimistic hope. In view of our differences we have to find a balance between splendid isolation, a blind clinging to all traditions and a sudden abandonment of attitude leading to capitulation.

The customary ecclesiastical structures and local disciplines serve to assure us of continuity as long as changes in balance are minor. But they themselves must change when the balance is upset by concessions due to an honest agreement on these and traditional positions formerly of a minor character. This radical change leads to a compromise which is acceptable to all only if the relative theses of both parties are changed and when, however, the people are willing not to leave room for superior powers and no longer cling to the privileges which they could institutionalise when they had more power in former times.

Let us take an example from hydrostatics: place a pane of glass between two reservoirs of water; the pane will resist pressure when it comes from both sides. But if one of the reservoirs were to be emptied and the other filled up even more, the pane of glass will break and the water will automatically return to the same level. The union of Christians is the pane of glass which breaks. The reconciliation of the Churches needs an insuperable power. Orthodox and non-Orthodox were more interested in powers which lead to isolation. On the other hand, it is not easy in the eddies of daily life to know when the situation is revolutionary and when it is a mere transitory tendency of fatigue due to confessionalism and a passing discontent. Even the greatest ecumenists make mistakes regarding such evaluations.

In conclusion, those faithful leaders stand in danger of accelerating their own falls if they act wrongly. Instinctively they pre-

fer to struggle blindly to keep what they have rather than run the risk of dialogue. Certainly we have to do all we can to avoid violence. Pastors have to make an effort to restore contacts with other Christians; they also have to strive to live prepared for concessions; they must know how to be flexible without giving way, to be prepared to make sacrifices.

In Orthodox theology dogma is not petrified, imprisoned in wording, and unchangeable in its shape and formulation. For instance, with regard to the two natures of Christ, the divine and the human, while the Church's views on this matter were adequately expressed at the Council of Ephesus, when she found herself confronted by new needs and the threat of Monophysitism, she moved on to the Chalcedonian definition. This definition in its essence was not new; in its new form it developed the same truths in a fresh way and one more suited to the time.

Such cases when reformulation and restatement are required confront us more frequently today. When we meet our brethren from other confessions we have to adjust our language, as far as possible, in accordance with theirs, and — as it were — to place our thinking also alongside theirs. A way can always be found of reinterpreting and presenting a dogma as a current issue. This flexibility follows naturally from the fact that doctrines, by their nature, are subject to restatement and fresh presentation. Their very purpose is to meet the needs of man, and these constantly present themselves in fresh ways.

One realisation of outstanding importance which emerges from the theological discussion of recent years is the need to clarify terms. It is possible for two people to use the same word in very different senses or to express the same concept in such different language that this verbal difference of formulation can of itself cause unreal clashes. Such clarifications became necessary for us when Orthodoxy came out of its age-long isolation. Not only did those who came to enquire of us from other Churches ask for explanations on a great variety of subjects, but even those within the Orthodox side felt a need to explain in current terms the ideas and formulae they held from the past. Thus there has arisen a great need of clarification also among ourselves. But we must take care to avoid the other danger of over-simplification. And we are grateful to those non-Orthodox who, on occasion, have offered us constructive criticism, and to all who endeavour to understand us.

In many areas of the Faith the heritage that we hold in common is far greater than anything that may divide us. At these points genuine dialogue is already possible. We can clear our minds of misconceptions concerning the beliefs of others, and we can try to build bridges of comprehension between different dialects of theological discourse, in order to establish points of genuine encounter. Such points of authentic correspondence do occur, and indeed occur on the most unexpected topics, as when one suddenly realises that, while certain verbal terms remain strange and unfamiliar, the concepts which those terms describe are not.

### *Essence and Form of Truth*

It is mistaken for Post-Reformation seekers and thinkers to take certain words, either from the Bible or from early theological terminology, and to try to give them an alternative meaning, a literal and a new interpretation. An honest work requires going deeper and further. There is an imperative need to penetrate into the framework of the Tradition where this or that word was maintained and acquired a certain meaning. Without such an approach we risk estranging the very heart of a word's meaning from its outer form; we overlook the wider sense of a crystallised word, as held in the consciousness of the people of God, and limit ourselves to a superficial knowledge of its grammatical sense. This means that we are in danger of isolating many deep insights and meanings from many important biblical and post-biblical expressions.

The attempt to transcribe and render them from an original language therefore presented enormous difficulties even in the old days. The advantage of the composite adjectives in Greek in contrast to the inadequacy of the Latin shows the difficulty of this problem.

A few examples suffice:

Ἄνδρες Ὁρθόδοξοι is rendered *homines recti Domini*.

Τὸ πρόσωπον as *abitus, persona*.

Πίστις, πιστεύω as *fides, credo, fideo*.

Θεοπνεύτως as 'a Deo inspiratus.'

Φύσις, ὑπόστασις, οὐσία as

*Natura, essentia, substantia*.

In our confessional perspective a decisive factor remains the historical evolution of doctrinal formula, reflecting the Catholic Faith of the undivided Church. It is not merely a matter of word-



ing and etymology; it concerns above all the authentic meaning of expressions of Faith, as understood by the consensus ecclesiae, the whole of Christendom during Ecumenical Councils, in the firm belief that they were guided and inspired by the Holy Spirit, and carefully chose the appropriate terms.

Another difficulty in giving an adequate picture of the very nature of the Church is the imperfection of human language. No word, even the most deep and theological, as in the case of the Patristic period, can express and define the indefinable. The great Fathers well understood this weakness of terminology and very often remind us of the limited character of the word used. With fear and consciousness they declare that we must go deeper, beyond the words and by holy disposition *θεοπρεπῶς*, look searchingly into their mystical meaning. By doing this penetrating exploration, everyone can see the salutary events of the Resurrection and the Church's victory over the world repeated within himself. Words lead us to the invisible realities.

If doctrinal conflicts arose concerning certain words, this was because the heretics, disregarding words, were fighting the implied truths so fundamental to our faith, which were associated with them. Since certain words were inseparably associated with doctrines, the Church realised that some of its essential principles were threatened. In fact, its counterattack was not directed against falsifiers of words but against ill-intentioned protagonists of errors. By defending words, or by insisting that this or that codified doctrinal formula or creed must be professed by a member, the Church succeeded in saving the faith. As the icons saved certain articles of the faith, so crystallised traditional words became 'sacred,' standardised, commonly accepted, because vital truths survived in them. Words became vehicles in the ascent to the divine. Words identified and revealed doctrines, as the incarnated Logos, Word, made known the Son of God.

We must not, of course, underestimate the persistent arguments of a minority that stress wording and formulation rather than essential substance in regard to our relationship. They make us aware that more (and more frequent and detailed) exploratory meetings are required, so that we may further clarify our respective positions, and better distinguish the purely doctrinal from the non-theological questions involved.

It is very clear that while the West was busy confronting a

whole series of problems different in kind from those that faced the East, the tradition in the theological schools of Alexandria, Syria, and Antioch tended towards scrutiny of the doctrine that the two natures were present in Christ without confusion.

It is perfectly clear that Greek culture in the Middle East contributed to the appearance of a specific way of thinking and vocabulary. All the intellectuals (among them the theologians) had recourse to Greek terminology in formulating their thought. It was inevitable that all those who remained outside this sphere of cultural influence should find such academic and theological terminology inaccessible and difficult to understand.

The fact that theologians were thus familiar with Greek culture explains a certain dependence of their thought on Greek philosophical terms and methods of formulation. I may give one or two examples. St. John Damascene, although of Syrian origin, lost no opportunity of recommending the reading of pagan Greek authors. In his *Fide Orthodoxa*<sup>6</sup> he likens good theologians to money-changers who are forewarned, and who treasure authentic coinage of pure gold and reject false money. John Zonaras in Chapter I, 3 of his historical writings and speaking of the Emperor Julian, notes how he became infuriated by the Christian intellectuals' use of the same words as those used by pagan authors, but with a different meaning. Again, Clement of Alexandria and Origen (the most impressive representatives of the Alexandrian theological school) endeavoured to Christianise Platonic philosophy. We find the same tendency in Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, who made full use of the cultural approach and choice of theological categories of the pagan philosophers when he was treating of Christian themes and subjects.

Already at the time of the apologist Athenagoras, there were people in the early Church who used an entirely literary style — for example, Tatian and Meliton of Sardis. Tatian was even criticised for his unsuccessful attempts to imitate the Greek style — Homer, Euripides, Plato.

The fourth century marked the beginning of Church mistrust of Greek culture in the Middle East and the rebirth of strong nationalism. Bitterness against certain abuses that might be committed by the dominating imperial power, or else by the Greek

---

<sup>6</sup> Chapter 4, 27; P.G. 94, 1177.

or Roman civil powers, led to mistrust of the churchmen who were deemed to be under their influence. From now on preference came to be given to indigenous languages and cultures. People studied Greek less and less, and when delegates attended Councils many found themselves in the awkward position of being hard-put to follow discussions or even to understand the doctrines debated.

It is my personal opinion that the cold attitude of the Egyptian and Syrian delegates at the Third Ecumenical Council of Ephesus was due to these psychological circumstances. Their hesitations did not stem from any premeditated or preconceived ill-intentions. They simply did not want to depart from the traditional formulae with which they were so familiar. Nor must we forget that in a number of cases these delegates actually provoked theological disagreements in order to justify their protests against the Byzantine domination of which they disapproved.

It was in part this mentality that eventually led to their pre-Chalcedonian's isolation from future theological developments in the rest of Christendom. Their isolation was in fact two-fold — geographical as well as theological. Among their theological difficulties not the least was the semantic one of understanding theologians who expressed themselves in Byzantine terminology. The barriers increased as time went on. Christological doctrine was to be completed by means of the further developments that took place at three more Ecumenical Councils — the Fourth at Chalcedon (451), the Fifth at Constantinople (553), and the Sixth also at Constantinople (680).

We can understand where we are doctrinally from our position today, for our Christological formulations are the outcome of all these Ecumenical Councils. None of the doctrines held by our Faith is to be understood as resulting from the deliberations of one isolated Council. All the Councils together have formed and shaped our doctrines. One Council has complemented the other, or elaborated at greater length what was stated in embryo by a preceding one.

#### *Relative Value of Formulas and Structures*

Essential uniformity in faith can easily be reconciled with possible pluralism in the practice of faith. Here are some extracts from this important argument:

It is obvious that great headway has been made, by success-

fully disposing of misunderstandings and arriving at a more complete and precise knowledge of the foundations of faith on all sides. Not without a certain joy, an affinity has been re-discovered, which has been lost sight of owing to traditional historical prejudices. All this, however, is only the first step on the road to unity. Yet it is an exceedingly important step. Perhaps only future generations will realise its full importance. Yet, for all its importance, it is not unity itself. It is only a healthy improvement in the climate of relations: a dispelling of the mist, which at times has been extremely dense, a glimmer of dawn raising hopes of a gloriously sunny day. That is why there is every reason to thank God for this mercy with all our hearts, and to go on working optimistically.

The final goal of which we must never lose sight is unity of faith. This does not involve a steam-rolling process, in which everyone would renounce part of his faith, in order to meet on common in word and identical formula ground. Ecumenical efforts should never be identified with diplomatic negotiations, where the custom is to make mutual concessions. In this case one is dealing with divine revelation, in which God has made known to the world His mysteries and His commandments. Together we must seek this truth — the whole truth. We must never remain content with the highest common denominator able to satisfy all sides; for that would only be an apparent unity. It is not a question of what men can accept or wish to accept, but what the Lord has willed. We must try to discover His wishes; after that, it is our duty to accept them without conditions or provisos, humbly, sincerely, and joyfully.

### *Refusal of False Pretenses*

Everyone of us — that is, who wish to be Christians — can always pray together for this unity, provided we do not assume we have reached it merely because we are praying together. Precisely when we are praying together, we must maintain a deep consciousness of our division, so as not to be lulled by this apparent unity.

In such a context, sharing in each other's sacraments, as far as I am concerned, is meaningless, because we do not share the same belief in these sacraments. Such 'intercommunion' should rather be recognised as a danger for the real unity of Christendom. Certainly it can be a striking demonstration of the desire

for unity, when members of many different confessions partake together of the Lord's Supper. But such 'intercommunion' would also manifest a unity which does not really exist, as long as we do not all profess the same faith concerning Jesus' intention in instituting the Last Supper. The Orthodox Church should not be expected to approve such 'intercommunion' which relegates doctrinal unity to second place. In spite of all the good intentions implicit in such initiatives, it is to be feared that these may increase the existing confusion. If we really want to discover our Lord's intention, we must plod along patiently and not be satisfied with a specious unity. However tragic the separation between Christians, one cannot hope to suppress it by suppressing the doctrinal problem. It is just not possible.

Whereas unity of faith is essential for the Church, uniformity has only relative value. Important though it be, one must not attribute to it an absolute value.

It is not very important, in this ecumenical age, for the Church as a whole to grasp these distinctions clearly, and to apply them. Those of the faithful who have learnt to know and love the Church know the value of uniformity in the Church. But those outside the pale, when they come face to face with such uniformity, will often have difficulty in discerning the proper sphere of essential Church unity. They risk confusing unity with uniformity, and so do not distinguish the true face of the Church. They will take as catholic that which in fact is only Slavonic, Byzantine, or Roman, and fail to see the proper place of Catholicity in the Church. They will take its local cultural appearance for its basic character. There is a whole question of outward appearance and even a type of centralization conditioned by history, resulting from the Church's regarding the practices of each local Church as valid for one region. But these factors, the value of which we recognize, do not constitute an indispensable and immutable form of the Church of Christ.

It is equally true that there are cases where no one can define precisely where the form ends and where the essence begins. In the history of worship and dogma there are elements so closely interwoven and incorporated that it is a delicate operation to distinguish them, and to consider the constituting elements separately. This explains why many heresies in the past arose owing to departure from commonly-accepted terms. Dogma is dressed in words, which are to a certain extent unchangeable and irreplace-

able. This relationship is stated by Basil of Caesarea:

In the manner in which we are baptised, so similarly we confess our Faith. And as we confess our Faith, so similarly we sing our doxology. Since our Baptism was given to us by our Saviour, it is in conformity with this Baptism that we proclaim our confession of Faith; and it is in like conformity that we render glory to the Faith.<sup>7</sup>

Of course, the Church could never envisage a plurality of forms of truth. Truth is one. The Church must do everything in its power to protect the oneness of revealed truth. On the other hand, it must not be afraid of plurality in the practice of this unique faith if, at a given moment, this pluriformity can facilitate the discovery of essential 'notae ecclesiae' (characteristics of the Church). It is not excluded that a certain type of uniformity might veil the true unity of the Church, whereas a certain measure of plurality in the practice of faith might bring out more strikingly the deep nature of this unity.

#### *Essential Points at Stake Today*

Once the problem of unity of faith has been solved it will, of course, be extremely difficult (in the relations between our confessional groups) to decide in which cases plurality of form is more important for the Church than uniformity. An ecumenical consensus of this can be arrived at only if all the Churches which confess the one Saviour have an opportunity to express their opinion.

Is it not possible that love of the Church and care for those outside it may require us, in our ecumenical age, to sacrifice certain non-essentials — however dear they may be to us, however precious to the Church — that may impede a clear vision of the Church's true face? Would one be a less faithful son of the Church, if one were prepared to sacrifice a little of this uniformity in the interests of the Church which, in our day and age, might be more important? Today it is the essentials that are in jeopardy. We must not waste our time and energy in attempts to save minor family wealth, while the whole house is in danger of burning to the ground. Without ignoring the gifts of history or the accumulated treasures of a developing Christian civilization, without repudiating the flowering of mysticism down the centu-

---

<sup>7</sup> St. Basil, *Epist.* 159, II. P.G. 32, 620-621.

ries, we have nevertheless to return more frequently to the sources, to the only forces which can heal the tragic division of modern society.

### ORTHODOXY AS GUARDIAN AND CUSTODIAN: ITS ROLE UNDERESTIMATED

Orthodoxy is often regarded as if it were merely some venerable survival from an illustrious past. At other times it is merely regarded as a mine containing an immense wealth of liturgical and Patristic doctrine. Such points are valid in my judgment, but I think they are inadequate. There are many other aspects of Orthodoxy, which are dynamic and relevant to our contemporary situation and to ecumenical encounter.

I do not intend here to elaborate an apologia. In my judgment the prime merit of Orthodoxy is that it has succeeded in preserving an inherited truth unadulterated by alteration. To keep something intact is not easy. Demosthenes already in his day observed:

that it was more difficult to preserve something after one had acquired it, than it was to acquire it in the first place.

To preserve — in the sense in which I am using the word — means to keep and protect something precious from adulteration, falsification, the endless series of potential enemies that may threaten or menace its existence or at least its essential substance. To preserve a living organism (such as the human body) in sound health is no slight task. It requires continuous efforts, firm discipline, the acceptance of restrictions, some degree of abnegation, perhaps the careful choice of food, of climate, and so on.

Our Church, all the Orthodox Churches, have had to struggle unceasingly to create and maintain conditions that would prevent the possibility of misinterpretation or alteration of the Faith that had been handed to us through the attacks of heretics. We still have to continue this struggle, sometimes under very severe and difficult conditions. But no period of our history has in our view been static or sterile — though some outside our Church would assert that this has been the case. Or course, there have been periods when extremely unfavourable circumstances prevented the abundant production of theological works, or the translation of the works produced into the language of the West, as one could have wished. But the essential fact remains that even during such periods of critical difficulty, the Orthodox Church has kept

intact that which she received. She has passed down the unadulterated tradition. This, in our judgment, is a great service to have rendered. And it is not only a service that Orthodoxy has rendered to itself. It is a service that it has rendered, and still renders, to the whole family of Christ; we feel that it is a service of value, and that Western theologians do not always feel as free as we could wish to explore the rich treasures of Orthodoxy.

We do not deny that there are many dark pages in our history, that there have been in the past, and are still in the present, many imperfections and sad events occurring in the Orthodox world. This is all true. But again, the one essential fact remains — the doctrine handed down to us from the earliest times has been preserved in its integrity and authenticity — intact and unadulterated. Members of the Western Churches are naturally free to observe, judge, examine, compare, and decide how justified they feel this claim to be. But perhaps, during this stage of the ecumenical dialogue, while we are struggling to learn to understand the West, and while the West is coming to understand us better, Christians in the West may not be unhappy to have as one of their partners in the ecumenical dialogue a Church that even in moments of crucial danger has been given the grace to behave in essentials as a faithful steward, a Church which has often preferred to die rather than deny its heritage, which has been handed down unbroken from generation to generation within the fold of the faith given by Christ.

Even when faced by Moslem invasion, these Orthodox Christians refused to accept military aid from Roman Catholic states, because this would have meant accepting the primacy of the Pope as the Vicar of Christ on earth. Rather than deny the truth, they preferred military defeat.

In this commentary on the Nicene Creed reflecting his predominant interest in the mystical interpretation of Byzantine worship, Symeon, Archbishop of Thessalonika (1429), refutes the arguments put forward by the Roman Church to justify its departure from the Synodical system. The Roman Church introduced innovations into the system by claiming that the sole and supreme authority for deciding on and promulgating dogmas was the Roman Pontifex. This was an entirely new practice (says Archbishop Symeon). Until then it had been the rule to consult all the Bishops of all the local Churches; it was only then, on the basis of their common agreement and consensus, that a Decree that



had been promulgated was accepted as valid and having binding force.

St. Symeon writes:

You refute the common principle of religious life, the Creed (Symbol of Faith), the seal of patristic theology, by adding to it as you do . . . you withdraw yourself from the agreement of the Holy Synods. . . . You set yourself up as the only judge of all those Fathers who did not accept (this misinterpretation), for they proclaimed the attributes of God after common consultation. . . . And this manifestly was also the practice of the Archbishop of Rome himself at the time of the Synods. For they were men of humility, being authentic disciples of Christ; and they therefore did not rely upon their own judgment in matters of faith, but took common consultation with their brothers. Similarly it was along with the others that they affixed their seal, thus following the consensus of the Church. For they knew the saying of Christ, that 'where two or three are gathered together . . .'<sup>8</sup>

Orthodoxy does not seek immobility; but she does adhere with the whole of her being to the fidelity that is spoken of in the Book of Revelation, in the second chapter, verse 25: 'That which you have, hold fast till I come.'

This is the essential aspect of our theology, this desire for absolute fidelity to that which was handed down to us, so that we in our turn may hand down the fullness of that which we received (neither more nor less than this fullness), to those who come after us. And it will be a source of fruitful happiness for us in the ecumenical dialogue if when the West endeavours to evaluate Orthodoxy, and when we meet with our Western fellow-Christians in the ecumenical dialogue, we can feel that it is a little possible for the West to perceive in us something of what we see in ourselves.

#### ACTUAL OBSTACLES ON THE ROAD TO UNITY

It is certainly not easy for three major theologies, one Eastern and two Western, to be united at once like magic after being separated for many centuries. It is not easy to rediscover, concealed behind the screen of different words, the same realities

---

<sup>8</sup> Commentary on the Creed, 'Proceeding from the Father': P.G. 155, 785-789.

and meanings. The difficulty lies in the fact that I have to interpret my thought in terms of the thought of others, and reinterpret their thought in terms of my own. Our task is to explain a revealed truth in a comprehensible way. We must neither compromise with regard to the truth ourselves, nor violently attack the convictions of others. We must not gloss over errors with a show of easy tolerance, for we cannot be tolerant of untruth. We have to find out how to break a way through to understanding; we have to learn to listen patiently, making our enquiries our own convictions without feelings of superiority, hostility, or fanaticism.

It is easy to understand that for such a process to be authentic and effective, it must advance slowly. Unless the advance is slow it cannot hope to be sure. Slow progress is far preferable to complete inactivity and endless quarrels. People often complain about ecumenists, maintaining that they slow down, rather than hasten, efforts towards re-union. The theologians, they claim, want endless discussions, and simply hinder that re-union that is so much desired by all mankind. The blame is unjustified. Such critics misjudge the ecumenists because they forget that their task is an extremely difficult one. Our goal is to attain a return to solid, durable unity, and not just a fusion of sentimentality and uncontrolled emotional feeling. Such criticism therefore lacks both understanding and charity. Hasty and psychologically unprepared denominational fusions can only lead to superficial amalgamations which do not last, and these in turn may have disastrous effects on true ecumenical thinking and thus cannot foster the growth of true ecumenical feeling and spirit.

Unity does not mean and cannot mean a species of confessional ecclesiasticism where one is free to choose according to one's taste. Doctrine forms a completely homogeneous whole. Truth demands that one can not choose to accept certain facets of truth, while rejecting others. Truth, and all aspects of truth, form an organic entity. Dogma cannot co-exist with syncretism and fragmentation of doctrine. All its parts are inseparable and indissoluble. We must not seek easy and transitory solutions.

Ecumenism, then, has nothing in common with sentimentality. Nor can it be dissociated from a healthy spiritual life. It leads to deep and serious changes in the way of life of the man who seeks to attain the fulness of fellowship in Christ.

We must begin by recalling that the possibilities of misunder-

standing between Eastern and Western Christians are very great. Nearly a thousand years (a much longer period than that since the Reformation in the West) have elapsed since the Great Schism of 1054 — and the Great Schism, in many ways, merely formalized the divisions between Byzantium and Rome, between Greek and Latin, which had run deep for centuries before that. For a thousand years at least, there has been more suspicion between us than friendly and brotherly contact. This is a fact which tells us much about the history of Europe and the Near East — not only ecclesiastical history but political history also. The whole conception of the 'Iron Curtain' (in my view one of the most harmful phrases ever invented) does not spring simply from modern ideological considerations. It springs also from many invisible historical memories and national sentiments. But we may be grateful to God that we live in a generation when, through the ecumenical movement, we have greater opportunities of conversation and fellowship with Eastern Orthodox Christians than at any time for a thousand years. There is no task more important (and perhaps more difficult) for us today than to use these opportunities fruitfully.

Why should the Western traditions take the Orthodox so seriously today? I give only a few reasons, perhaps the most obvious, out of many.

(1) Since the Orthodox Churches entered the World Council of Churches in 1961, there have been probably more Orthodox Christians within our fellowship than members of any other denomination. It is a fact that the W.C.C., which was in its earliest days an overwhelmingly Protestant organization, run on Western Protestant lines, financed with Western Protestant money, staffed by Western Protestant leaders, can no longer be thought of in this way. This does not mean that any radical change has yet taken place in the W.C.C. Its procedures are still almost entirely Western; the three official languages of the Council are Western languages; the Orthodox are still very thinly represented on its staff; and the Orthodox Churches are still unable to contribute a great deal in the way of money, manpower, or theological literature. Nevertheless they are there, millions of them, as pledged members of our ecumenical fellowship.

This is going to require of us, step by step, a very considerable reorientation of our thinking about the whole Church and about

the future of Christianity in this world. That reorientation is bound to have its painful moments, especially for those who have preferred to forget that Orthodoxy exists at all, or who have written it off as a corrupt and decayed form of the Christian religion.

(2) The Orthodox Churches represent an extremely important third party in that ecumenical encounter which has come to occupy our minds so much since the encounter in Rome. Most important of all, the Orthodox adhere formally to the belief that they are the one undivided Church and that other Christians (including the Roman Catholics) have separated themselves from the true tradition of the Church and are to that extent defective. Let no one, therefore, make the mistake of simply putting the Orthodox 'into the same sack' as the Roman Catholics. — Again, the ecumenical conversation since the beginning of Vatican II has revealed in an interesting way that sometimes the Orthodox are closer to Protestants than they are to Roman Catholics — in their doctrine of the Holy Spirit, for example, or in their attitude towards the local church, they might find greater affinities with Congregationalists or even with Pentecostalists than with most Roman Catholics! Conversely, it has been found that Roman Catholics and Protestants sometimes find it much easier to deal with one another than with the Orthodox — for, after all, they share (whether we like it or not) a common Western heritage of language, culture, and theological ideas. This discovery has sometimes provided big surprises in Rome or in Geneva, but the shock is good for us!

The Orthodox participation in the ecumenical movement, although still at a very early stage, is much too large to be ignored by people in the West. It is significant already, but it can become much more significant in the future if we are not deaf and blind to God's calling to unity. It is significant that a Church which claims, in some exclusive sense, to be the Church of Christ on earth is yet willing to accept membership of the W.C.C., on equal and fraternal terms, although not surrendering one jot of its ecclesiological claims. No longer is it permissible simply to speak of 'the Eastern churches,' unless we remember that we are speaking in a theological, not a geographical, sense. The evolution of Orthodoxy in North and South America — i.e., in the context of Western, pluralist Christianity — is of the deepest importance, not only for the Orthodox themselves but for the whole ecumenical movement.

menical movement. Not all Westerners were guilty of despising Orthodoxy as a corrupt survival from the past, but we may understand how the Orthodox resented them as foreigners, and found them largely ignorant of the languages and religious culture of the ancient churches of the East. To destroy the unity of the Church is, according to Orthodox thinking, one of the most grievous sins of which Christians are capable, and it seemed to them that some of the missionaries were prepared quite recklessly to introduce division and sectarianism, all in the name of the Gospel. It made matters worse when these missionaries had much larger resources of money, buildings, and education — and perhaps the threat of political and social influence in the background. There are, of course, various things which the Western missionaries could have said in reply; the most obvious is, 'How is it that a Christian community like yours could have existed for so long within a non-Christian society, without having any visible effect upon it?' My concern at the moment is not to enter upon that debate, but to explain the apparently intransigent attitude of many Orthodox Churches even today towards certain Evangelical Churches.

First, it should be said quite frankly that the Orthodox themselves need to find a much deeper measure of unity within their own Communion, and that the ecumenical movement should help them to do so. It is somewhat paradoxical that these churches which insist so much upon their dogmatic unity within the apostolic tradition should in fact have many divisions between themselves, which often paralyze their ability to speak and act together. Yet so it is, and the divisions to which I refer are all the more difficult to overcome because they spring largely from reasons which are not theological but are rather national or political in origin. The sad separations among Orthodox émigrés in the Western countries into different and sometimes mutually hostile jurisdictions must (please God) disappear with the passing of time. Meanwhile, they provide a poor witness to the principle of one bishop for the Church in each place. Apart from this, the relations between the Churches of Constantinople, Greece, Russia, Roumania, Bulgaria, Serbia, and others are apt to be disturbed by factors of national tradition, policy or prestige. This is the price which has to be paid for the Orthodox principle of autocephalous Churches, without anything corresponding to the centralized authority of the Vatican.

*Not an Exclusive Monopoly of Truth*

Objective research reveals the need to respect the mentality and culture of every type of person in order to complete all the aspects of human personality and the consequences which it has for the Church, especially on the value of the individual churches.

In bygone times, diversity in unity defended liberty, autonomy, and a vital reaction of those interested, which is necessary so that a cultural exchange may be fruitful and free from compulsion. In fact, there is no common human nature; the special characteristics of human beings are different expressions of human nature.

Consequently the Western expression of Christianity cannot be expressed in any other way but 'no one has the exclusive monopoly in understanding and fulfilling the Gospel.'

There is no one universal Church which is pure, perfect, and pre-existing. The Church exists only thanks to her incarnation in different forms amongst each people. Diversity is not contrary to unity, for particular churches form a communion enriched by this diversity. When faith is lived in a proper manner, this faith is stronger and can compete with universal faith. The Revelation has expressed itself in one decided culture.

A particular Church is not bound to a given territory but rather to a socio-cultural milieu — to a people. It is obvious that it is not a question of 'particularistic' church.

The Patristic teaching insists on this mystery of the Church: it is not a fabricated Church, but it is Christ present in the hearts of men which we have to help reveal.

No theology is of any value unless it springs from the time of the Revelation and aims at the redemption of man without disregarding the cultural milieu. The dogma is unchangeable, but our knowledge of the unchangeable evolves; each Christian community must render its contribution to the full understanding of the message. It is not a case of the 'small liturgical reforms,' but of going back to the source itself of the culture and the theological expression.

This diversity should equally be moving towards the diversity of the sacerdotal ministry, for 'a suitable priest must come from a given community.' The diversity of origin and the formation of the clergy seems to impose itself at this point.

THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES  
ECUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

## A SYNOPSIS OF EASTERN ORTHODOXY AND THE SECULAR: A HISTORICAL INSTANCE

DANIEL F. MARTENSEN

In the teaching of theology, as in the instance of the unerring hand of a sloppy dentist, one touches sensitive nerves with fantastic regularity. As evidenced by recent religious authorship and discussion, the contemporary nerve of methodology is a raw and exposed one. Hence, the following preliminary comment is in order; it is a methodological observation which qualifies our discussion of Eastern Orthodoxy and the secular.

The significance of the secular world's addressing of questions to the Orthodox Christian Tradition, or the reverse, does not lie in the question or the answer. Rather the importance lies in that which shapes both question and answer, i.e., the uniqueness of the relationship between the two. This means, more specifically, that the historical context (not a concept or an issue) has to be the source from which significant verbiage emanates — and the focal point of study. It is assumed that conceptualizations such as secularism, secularization, even the secular, grow out of the common-sense<sup>1</sup> historical experience of man in unique settings. Little is then gained from bleeding a given setting for more information in order to sharpen a sloppy concept. For example, a wild chase after the real meaning of "Aión" (αἰών) in Orthodox thought could lead to an impressive compilation of data. Having completed such a study one might announce to the world that "Aión" had been used to connote — age, eternity, lifetime, time, era, epoch, period; the list could continue. It could also be indicated that its specific function varied within each Orthodox spokesman from the Cappadocians to Bulgakov, as well as among them. To grab hold of such a handle to begin a discussion of Orthodoxy and the secular would be pointless.

For these reasons an attempt will be made in this paper to deal with a limited historical episode (one yet unfinished) in the life of Orthodoxy — the Russian Religious Renaissance of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The rationale for this selection

---

<sup>1</sup> A term used by Professor Paul Holmer of Yale to indicate that basic historical human experience *from* which the philosophical exercises of men move.



is this; at no time in modern Christian history have the ingredients in human experience which give birth to concepts such as the secular and ideologies such as secularism had a more direct, far reaching, and explosive confrontation with a self-conscious Christian community.

# I.

## CONCERNING THE RUSSIAN RELIGIOUS RENAISSANCE

A number of historical traditions, forces, and movements interacted to set the stage for the Religious Renaissance in Russia. First, there was the Orthodox Christian tradition which reached Russia late in the tenth century. Since St. Vladimir and the Kievan period, there has been a uniqueness about Russian Orthodoxy which distinguished it from its Byzantine parents.<sup>2</sup> At the risk

---

<sup>2</sup> Professor Panagiotis P. Bratsiotis of the University of Athens Theological School indicates a basic difference in accent between his tradition and the Russian when he says in *The Central Idea of Orthodoxy*, pp. 2-3: "The Question of the fundamental principles and main characteristics of the Orthodox Church was first raised not by Orthodox but by Roman Catholic and Protestant theologians. In attempting to answer it many misunderstandings and adverse comments have arisen on both sides. Adolf Harnack's particularly sharp, negative criticism of Orthodoxy is well known. Opinions like Harnack's evoked strong reactions on the part of Orthodox theology, and led it to seek a deeper understanding of its own nature and task. This question has been and still is as difficult as it is important, not only for self-knowledge within the Orthodox Church, but also for promoting debate and understanding with other Churches within the framework of the ecumenical movement. This explains why the question was placed first on the agenda of the first pan-Orthodox conference on Orthodox theology held at Athens in 1936, and why it is now one of the main subjects of our small meeting on Faith and Order.

We must first examine whether there exists in the Orthodox Church any fundamental principle or essential characteristic or central idea from which the essence of Orthodoxy springs.

Many attempts to discover a synthesis have been made by both Orthodox and non-Orthodox theologians; others have considered all such attempts hopeless. The common idea that Orthodoxy lies halfway between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism may perhaps be accepted. But although this idea is in general correct, it touches only on the form of the Orthodox Church. The question remains: what is the essence of Orthodoxy, quite apart from Roman Catholicism and Protestantism? What would remain of Orthodoxy if there were no antithesis between these Churches, as Gluboskovsky and Zankov rightly observe?

The same applies to the idea that the main characteristic of Ortho-

of terrible oversimplification, one might suggest that this uniqueness is embodied in the pregnant word "*sobornost*." "*Sobornost*" is a Slavonic noun derived from the verb "*sobirat*" (to bring together); it is used as an adjective in the Nicene Creed in translating "catholic" (*soborny*). Its meaning in the English would be roughly "harmony, reciprocity, and unity in freedom."

The authority in Russian Orthodoxy lies here; it is the self-knowledge of the Church and its infallibility. "*Sobornost*" does not mean a passive preservation of religious truth but an active possession of it. More will be said of "*sobornost*" later; let it now suffice to say that *sobornost* in the Church appears in its life and activity earlier than in its rational-doctrinal consciousness. This unique emphasis in the Russian Orthodox tradition has been a constant one. Despite the Tartar rule and the Muscovite domination of the Church (the many centuries during which the throne was bolted to the top of the altar), despite inner turmoil, crisis, despite encounter with the West, and schism, *sobornost* has remained. For one immediate concern, the encounter with the West emerges as the second leading ingredient of the Religious Renaissance.

---

doxy is the principle of balance: the balance which it maintains between the human element (stressed in Roman Catholicism) and the divine element (which predominates in Protestantism). Other scholars, such as Professor Androutsos regard the concept of "freedom with authority" (*eleutheria met authentias*) as the dominating principle in Orthodoxy. This phrase does indeed express the spirit of the Orthodox Church, but it also is only a description of form; it does not provide the key to an understanding of the principles and characteristics, and in fact the whole nature, of that Church.

Still more concerned with form is the view that Orthodoxy constitutes the "all-embracing plenitude," which some other scholars (Gluboskovsky, Florensky, Zjenkovsky, etc.) regard as its main characteristic.

In our view, the fundamental principle in Orthodoxy is rather the idea that the Orthodox Church adheres to the principles and piety of the early, undivided Catholic Church.

This fundamental idea constitutes (in our opinion) the most prominent feature of Orthodoxy, and contains the norm and criterion of its truth its claim to be the early Catholic Church itself."

The treatise just quoted was first presented to the Faith and Order Orthodox Consultation held in Greece, 1959. This article appeared in the *Ecumenical Review*, January, 1960, and was reprinted in an "Ologos" pamphlet.

Thomas Masaryk<sup>3</sup> asserts that before the time of Peter the Great (prior to 1685) Russia had no secular culture, and properly speaking, no spiritual culture. Until then the shape of the community and its thought had been in the hands of the Russian church which Masaryk maintained had neither theology nor philosophy. In Constantinople, Rome, Germany, and England, centuries of independent philosophical-theological development had prepared the way for critical scientific thought. For example, in the European West the ideas of Voltaire, Hume, Kant, Comte, Fichte, Hegel, and Feurbach were organic links in a chain of cultural development. The introduction of these same ideas into Russia on the other hand had a religiously explosive and revolutionary effect. Russia had neither Renaissance nor Reformation in her cultural past. The Russian Orthodox Church, in Masaryk's view, could not help being overwhelmed by the flood of anti-clericalism and devastating criticism which poured from the pens of Voltaire, Diderot, and Rousseau. Then in a kind of relentless parade the German influence of Hegel and the Hegelian-left was added to that of the French. With Feuerbach came materialism, with Comte and Mill came positivism, and with Darwin and Spencer; evolutionism. Also, those seeking political thought systems and guidelines drank heavily from cups of liberal and socialistic thinkers — Saint-Simon, Proudhon, and later Karl Marx.<sup>4</sup>

Many of Masaryk's observations have been qualified by later historians,<sup>5</sup> but one fundamental insight is of great significance. He sees the nihilism and anarchism developing in Russia from this unbridged gap between the Orthodox milieu and the West's materialistic and positivistic orientation.<sup>6</sup>

There is widespread agreement among students of Russian philosophical thought that the consistently present themes in Russian thought<sup>7</sup> are directly attributable to Russia's spiritual past.

---

<sup>3</sup> Masaryk, a scholar-statesman, became president of the new-born Czechoslovakia shortly after the First World War. In 1913 he published the two volume *Spirit of Russia: Studies in History, Literature and Philosophy*. His third volume was to have been a study of Dostoevsky.

<sup>4</sup> It is interesting to note that Mill and Darwin were buried in Westminster Abbey. Their followers in Russia found their way to Siberia.

<sup>5</sup> Zenkovsky, N. O. Lossky.

<sup>6</sup> Masaryk held that F. Dostoevsky devoted his life to the study of this basic problem and hence a serious study of him should "bare the soul of Russia."

<sup>7</sup> The three most significant historical studies of Russian thought were

Prior to the eighteenth century there were no independent works, or even brief essays, of a philosophical nature in Russia. All philosophical interests were then contained in the religious world-view. Whatever "secularization" (however one wishes to define this) was taking place before this time took place within the ecclesiastical consciousness, or outside of it, but never in opposition to it.

There are certainly reasons for this late critical-philosophical awakening in Russia. The first is that Russia received Christianity from an alien and distant land. Quite the opposite from the European experience, there was in Russia no linguistic connection with antiquity. The iconography<sup>8</sup> and mysteries of the Trinity and Godmanhood were manifestations of a latent creative potential in the realm of philosophical or secular thought. But now to turn to the nineteenth century.

By 1825, after the Decembrist affair,<sup>9</sup> French rationalism was being replaced by French utopian socialism, and German romanticism was being replaced by German idealism. At this time (1836) and into a charged cultural atmosphere came the "Philosophical Letter" of Chaadyaev.<sup>10</sup> This letter set activities

---

written by Thomas Masaryk, V. V. Zenkovsky, and N. O. Lossky. Regardless of the differences among these men in their method of treatment and evaluation of the documents, there is a consensus of opinion among them regarding the unique thematical content of Russian philosophical thought. They all agree that:

- 1) Russian philosophy reveals a keen sense of reality — as opposed to regarding the contents of perception as mental or subjective. This, they assert, to a certain extent explains the Russian philosopher's confidence in mystical intuition. Zenkovsky traces this element back to the iconographic activity of the fourteenth century.
- 2) It accents integral experience — the working out of an organic synthesis (note the connections here with sophiology and *sobornost'*).
- 3) It is concerned with ethics. What might be called ethical-personalism stands as a constant ingredient in Russian thought; Even the champions of radical naturalism and positivism assign to ethics an independent and sometimes dominant position. Tolstoy's pan-moralism can be detected in varying degrees in most Russian thinkers.

<sup>8</sup> Note A. Rublev.

<sup>9</sup> The putting down of a small revolt against Czar Nicholas I.

<sup>10</sup> Pyotr Y. Chaadyaev was an officer of the guards, philosopher, and essayist; he died in 1856. As a young man he was a friend of Pushkin and close to the Decembrists. In 1836 in the *Teleskop* he published the

in motion which led to the formation of two distinctive ideological camps. Herzen, Belinsky, and Bakunin formed the center of radical Westernism; Khomyakov, Kireevsky, Aksakov, and Samarin joined arms to form the core of the Slavophil movement. The final break between the Westerners and Slavophiles was complete by 1844-1845. These were groups of practical-minded men; they moved quickly from the philosophical-religious presupposition to the political-social ideology. The Westernizers, of course, wanted Russia to move quickly along the road of Europeanization. The Slavophiles advocated that Russia explore and develop its own spiritual resources; they claimed that Russia was the embodiment of an original culture.

In the middle of the nineteenth century a unique cultural group came on the scene — the intelligentsia. It had grown gradually and was by mid-century an articulate and distinctive body. Nicolas Zernov calls it a Secular Order. The Order engaged in a struggle with the monarchy which ended in the death of both of them. The leadership of the intelligentsia changed as the decades passed; the group was always small<sup>11</sup> and its members came from all quarters of Russian culture. The power of the group lay in the fact that it sought after truth — *pravda*.<sup>12</sup> Zernov says,

The intelligentsia discharged religious energy stored by the nation during the centuries of its life under the bright cupolas of the Orthodox Churches. The Order never questioned those fundamental affirmations at which the Russian Christians arrived under the transforming and regenerating influence of Eucharistic worship. The intelligentsia professed a distorted and inconsistent set of doctrines, most of which had Christian inspiration; it retained some parts of the New Testament message with passionate conviction and rejected others with the same ardour. It repudiated the Revelation which is the foundation of the Christian faith, and thus released itself from obedience to Christ's precepts: the intelli-

---

"Philosophical Letter" which ruthlessly criticized Russian history. He questioned the very right of the Russian people to a future. He attacked serfdom and the government had him declared insane. He later wrote *Apology of a Madman*.

<sup>11</sup> It was first just a few thousand.

<sup>12</sup> "Pravda" means in Russian not only "truth," but also "justice."

gentsia felt therefore free to experiment.<sup>13</sup>

The Order was closely connected to the Westernizing orientation but not identical with it.

Recent history has told the sad story of how this Order was destroyed by a minority within itself: the Marxists. But there is a positive aspect here; the Christian faith was recovered by a number of people within the Order—and a connection was then welded between them and the rest of the Russian people and their spiritual past. We shall be concerned with the central representative figures of the Movement, all of whom were at one time Marxists—Piotr Struve (d. 1944), Sergey Bulgakov (d. 1944), Simeon L. Frank (d. 1950), Nicholas Berdyaev (d. 1948).<sup>14</sup>

These men were respected members of the intelligentsia. When they with inside knowledge spoke out against the political, economic, and social assumptions of the Secular Order old men were shocked and young men were stimulated. The date of this crucial event in modern Russian religious history is 1909 and the event itself was the publication of *Vekhi* (signposts or landmarks). All four of the above named men contributed to this symposium. Within five months six editions of the book appeared and with them heated controversy. No contributor had seen the article of any other prior to going to print, yet there was an underlying unity in all of the writings. One basic contradiction in the thought of the intelligentsia was pointed out: How could the Order reconcile social utopianism with the materialistic belief that the universe was the outcome of blind physical forces? Furthermore, the writers hailed Christianity as the most progressive force in the history of mankind. They said it gave assurance that human aspiration could be in harmony with the will of the Creator who had revealed himself in Jesus Christ, and that a dynamic design for the universe is revealed in the life, death and

---

<sup>13</sup>Zernov, *Russian Religious Renaissance*, p. 30.

<sup>14</sup>Struve was a political leader, economist, writer, and member of the anti-Bolshevik government in the South after the revolution. Father S. Bulgakov became one of the greatest Orthodox theologians after an earlier career as a political scientist and economist. S. L. Frank was a philosopher and teacher. N. A. Berdyaev was a philosopher whose writings are well known in the West. All four men were exiled or left Russia in the early 1920's.

resurrection of Christ. The symposium asked the intelligentsia to come back to the Christian faith; it assured the reader that to ignore the Christian assertions about man and history would lead to enslavement. And it reiterated the prediction of Dostoevsky that a tyranny never paralleled in history would come as a result of atheistic egalitarianism.

In the last part of the article in *Vekhi* Bulgakov attempts to point out an even more basic contradiction in the mentality of the Secular Order: He says:

The soul of the intelligentsia is composed of contradictions as is the rest of Russian life. It is hard not to love it yet it is impossible not to be repelled by it at the same time. Side by side with the negative features which indicate its lack of culture and its political immaturity, there exist signs of spiritual beauty which make the intelligentsia resemble some unique and delicate flower grown on the soil of our bloody past. In spite of its anti-Christian bias it possesses religious potentialities of great power. . . . The crude maximalism of the Russian intelligentsia, with its practical uselessness and even harmfulness is the fruit of religious perversion, but it can be redeemed by the restoration of balance based on Christian sanity.<sup>15</sup>

There is optimism here; this kind of optimism was not born out of a rootless cultural renaissance which bloomed in Russia at the turn of the century. A link had been established with the recent past and the distant past, and the atmosphere was charged with a deep creative kind of optimism. Not only the philosophers and religionists were at work with a new set of presuppositions, but so too were the creative artists; all of these men, including Blok, Ivanov, and Kandinsky, were indebted to one or all of the following: Vladimir Solovyov,<sup>16</sup> F. Dostoevsky,<sup>17</sup> and Alexei Khom-

---

<sup>15</sup> Zernov, *Russian Religious Renaissance* quoting *Vekhi*, p. 122.

<sup>16</sup> Solovyov (1853-1900) is undoubtedly the greatest philosophical mind Russia has produced. His thought took shape in direct opposition to the metaphysics, materialism and empiricism of the Western thought to which he was exposed. He spoke of "unity" and "oneness" based upon a number of themes. To Solovyov, God's incarnation in Christ provided a unique guide to human life, implying the possibility of man's being elevated to godliness—Godmanhood. He saw social unity and individual freedom based upon justice to be essential to "Holy Russia." Rus-

yakov<sup>18</sup> — three creative geniuses of the nineteenth century. A more detailed study of this subject would have to give consideration to these men.

In the Russian cultural scene of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which we have been so boldly painting, two basic themes of thought and life emerge. It appears that these themes or motifs are not accidental but rather constitute that without which the rest of the language of the Renaissance would not make sense. These themes constitute the visions with which

---

sia to him was to provide a synthesis of the cultural and spiritual values of East and West. He spoke of a unique universal church which would accommodate Judaism. Note his *Three Conversations* and *Lectures on Godmanhood*.

<sup>17</sup> Fyodor Dostoevsky's (1821-1881) stature as a self-consciously religious thinker has often been underestimated if not ignored in the attempt to find a place for him in the West's scheme of the "history of the novel," or in the existentialist camp. All through his authorship Dostoevsky makes and develops an assertion about human freedom; this theme is to take its final shape in the "Legend of the Grand Inquisitor" in the *Brothers Karamazov*. He makes a clean break with rationalistic humanism and along with Nietzsche indicates that man's freedom is tragic and burdensome. Nietzsche was led by this to a vision of man-god; Dostoevsky saw God and man. In the well known "Legend" Dostoevsky says that man is offered the alternatives of the Grand Inquisitor or Jesus Christ. During the meeting with the Inquisitor the shadowy figure of Christ says nothing. Efficacious Christianity for Dostoevsky need not explain itself; freedom cannot be put easily into words; the case for compulsion, however, is rather freely expressed. Here divine love and humanitarian pity meet head on. For Dostoevsky the dilemma of facing freedom with suffering or contentment without freedom is an inescapable one. The *Brothers Karamazov* changed the lives of the key men in modern Russian religious life, not the least that of Berdyaev. It is not a mean compliment which Berdyaev gives Dostoevsky when he asserts that the fact that Dostoevsky lived is, in itself, justification for the presence of the Russian people on the face of the earth.

<sup>18</sup> Khomyakov, A. S., (1804-1860) the founder of the Slavophil movement, spoke freely of the "rotten" and "dying" Occident and preached about the special mission of "Holy Russia." The theology of Khomyakov is basically ecclesiology and this is beautifully expressed in *The Church Is One*. He speaks here of the infallibility of the Church and makes the now famous claim that the unity of the Church follows of necessity from the unity of God. This is so because the Church is not a multitude of persons in their separate individuality but rather a unity of the grace of God living in a multitude of rational creatures. Khomyakov was later to be called a "Doctor" of the Church — something of a tribute to this layman land owner, army officer, writer and poet.



the many complex religio-cultural interrelationships can be rendered meaningful. The first is the *vision of creative freedom*, the second, *the vision of integral cosmic transfiguration*. This thematic thrust of the Russian Religious Renaissance certainly has implications for specific thought on anthropology, Christology, and what is now being called the problem of nature and grace. In the following sections of this paper an attempt will be made to discuss and relate these visions using the thought of Struve, Frank, Bulgakov, and Berdyaev — particularly the latter two. Lastly, some possible ramifications of these visions for the wider Christian community will be pointed out.

## II.

### CREATIVE FREEDOM

Concerning the vision<sup>19</sup> of Creative Freedom Bulgakov says:

Orthodox theology in Russia, in the nineteenth century and in our day, contains a whole series of original theological individualities, which resemble each other very little and which are all equally Orthodox. The Metropolitan Philaret and A. J. Boukarev, Khomyakov and V. Solovyov, Dostoevsky and Constantine Leontiev, Fr. Florovsky and N. A. Berdyaev and others, despite many differences express, each in his own way, the Orthodox conscience, in a sort of theological rhapsody. Here lies the beauty and strength of Orthodoxy.<sup>20</sup>

A serious study of the Russian Religious tradition leads one to agree with the assertion just made by Bulgakov. There is a common set of visions, a common religious thrust which gives a unique kind of coherence or inner-connectedness to the nineteenth and twentieth century religious authorship of Russia. The material reflecting the Orthodox vision may be as different from one piece to the next as is the "Grand Inquisitor" chapter of *The Brothers Karamazov* from the Divine Liturgy. It is this characteristic of Russian thought which allows us to limit the

---

<sup>19</sup> The word vision is used here to avoid the use of "idea" or "doctrine" each of which might preclude our seeing the Orthodox context of religious life clearly.

<sup>20</sup> Bulgakov, *Orthodox Church*, p. 100.

bibliographical foundation of this discussion, for the sake of brevity, without jeopardizing the validity of its content.

Every modern Russian religious thinker, in his own way, speaks of creative freedom. S. L. Frank as he closes his article printed in *Vekhi* says this of Russian secularized socialism:

The Russian intelligentsia is confronted by the great and grave task of revision of its old values and the creation of new ones. In the event of success, it is possible that the change will be so radical that the intelligentsia in the traditional sense of the word will cease to exist, and this might be the best solution. From uncreative anti-cultural nihilistic moralism we must move to creative constructive religious humanism.<sup>21</sup>

The crisis of the age was to be met by creativity; with it, not with counter ideologies, could a new context, political, social, and religious, be born. It was for this reason that Bulgakov could say:

My faithfulness to the Church is the foundation of my life. I dedicated my entire being to its service after my return to Christianity. But my churchmanship is bound up with my recognition of the need of spiritual freedom. Where the spirit of the Lord is there also is freedom. Freedom is the greatest gift of God. Sins against freedom are sins against Orthodoxy and against the Church. . . .<sup>22</sup>

Certain assumptions about the relationship between creativity and freedom are shared by all modern Russian thinkers, but no single one has written more on the matter than N. A. Berdyaev.<sup>23</sup> We shall trace with some care the development of Berdyaev's thought on creative freedom.

Berdyaev considered himself to be a philosopher. Philosophy to him was a creative knowing act in the world, the purpose of which was not to construct a system. He asserted that religious intuition was the *sine qua non* of philosophy; every true philosopher, he said, had an original intuition of his own, an intuition

---

<sup>21</sup> *Vekhi*, p. 181. Quoted by Zernov, *Russian Religious Renaissance*, p. 124.

<sup>22</sup> Autobiographical notes, p. 44. Quoted by Zernov, *Russian Religious Renaissance*, p. 149.

<sup>23</sup> Matthew Spinka entitled his biography of Berdyaev, *Nicholas Berdyaev: Captive of Freedom*.

which could not be deduced from anything else. In his most germinal book, *The Meaning of the Creative Act*, Berdyaev writes:

Philosophy is creativeness and not adaptation or obedience. The liberation of philosophy as a creative act is liberation from all dependence upon science, i.e., heroic resistance to every sort of adaptation to necessity. . . . Philosophy is the art of knowing in freedom by creating ideas which resist the given world and necessity. . . .<sup>24</sup>

The creative task of the philosopher is a unique one to Berdyaev; this claim in no way denies the creative possibilities in all men. Berdyaev held that the Creator made man with definite qualities of genius and he felt that these qualities must express themselves in creative activity. The capacity for creativity is based solidly upon the Absolute-Man, Christ. In Christ human nature has already become the nature of the New Adam and is united with divine nature. It is for this reason, and this reason alone, that man no longer has the right to feel cast off and by himself. Berdyaev says that the feeling of isolation is itself against the divine calling of man. Only the man who experiences everything as being universal, only he who has conquered in himself the ego-centric drive for personal salvation and selfish reflection about his own powers is strong enough to be a true person and creator. It is only because of Christ that man has such unique creative possibilities. At a moment of true creativity, man, for Berdyaev, is not aware of the victory over sin, for he already feels free from its burden. Creative inspiration is then a spiritual experience, and this creative potential depends upon freedom.

One can get a hint of the centrality of freedom in Berdyaev's thinking by noting the following. Freedom, he says, is not created by God; rather, it is a part of the nothingness out of which the world is created. This contention indicates that the opposition between God and freedom is secondary in nature, and that the opposition is transcendent, for both freedom and God are manifested out of the *Ungrund*.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> *Meaning of Creative Act*, p. 29.

<sup>25</sup> To Berdyaev the *Ungrund* is: . . . nothingness, the groundless eye of eternity: and at the same time it is will, not grounded upon anything, bottomless, indeterminate will. But this is nothingness which is

In *Spirit and Reality* Berdyaev says this:

The irrational mystery of freedom independent of Divine creation and determination does not imply . . . the existence of another being claiming equality with Divine Being, it does not in the least imply an ontological dualism. A dualism of this sort would involve rationalization. Freedom postulated as the spontaneous origin of evil, as well as everything new in the world, is not the elaboration of any ontological or metaphysical doctrine, but an intuitive description of the mystery revealed in existence. Freedom exposes rational thought; it appears irrational, abysmal, without foundations, inexplicable, non-objectifiable. The mystery of freedom contains both the mystery of evil and that of creation. This gives birth to Divine tragedy, the dual communion, the diabolical struggle, the answer given by man to God.<sup>26</sup>

The tragic character of man's free answer to God can be discerned only if a clear distinction is made between two types of freedom. The first kind is the meonic, irrational freedom which is spiritual; it is "the spiritual element in man . . . the inner creative energy of man."<sup>27</sup> In describing irrational freedom in this manner, Berdyaev once again underlines the danger involved in opposing grace and freedom. Such an opposition can only be the result of an objectified concept of grace which is understood as a transcendent divine potency acting from without. What Berdyaev calls grace acts "within human freedom, as an interior illumination."<sup>28</sup> Grace and freedom stand not in opposition to one another, but in opposition to necessity. "Freedom is not a rigid and static category, it is the inner dynamic of the spirit, the irrational mystery of being, of life, and of destiny."<sup>29</sup>

---

"*Ein Hunger zum etwas.*" At the same time the *Ungrund* is freedom. In the darkness of *Ungrund*, fire flames up, and this is freedom, meonic potential freedom.

The freedom of the *Ungrund* is neither light nor darkness, it is neither good nor evil. Freedom lies in the darkness and thirsts for light: and freedom is the cause of light (Berdyaev, *The Beginning and the End*, New York, Harper, 1957, p. 106).

<sup>26</sup> Berdyaev, *Spirit and Reality*, pp. 105-106.

<sup>27</sup> Berdyaev, *The Realm of Spirit and the Realm of Caesar*, pp. 105-109.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 103.

<sup>29</sup> Berdyaev, *Freedom and the Spirit*, p. 121.

The second kind of freedom of which Berdyaev speaks is rational freedom. In contrast to irrational freedom, rational freedom in man consists in the overcoming of his lower nature; rational freedom is related to man's submission to moral law. In and by itself, this freedom, at best, leads man to a state of servitude to law or institution, or to a compulsory virtue. Man can be a slave to this freedom within reason, to this freedom which can lead only to truth (with a small "t") and goodness (with a small "g").

Irrational and rational freedom are respectively divine and human; but, Berdyaev asserts, they must not be regarded as mutually independent. One kind of freedom conditions the other; and there is a tragic quality in their reciprocal relationship. Taken independently, the first kind of freedom will lead to moral chaos, the second to tyranny — to an organized life in which freedom will be destroyed because the good is not accepted freely.<sup>30</sup> Herein lies the tragic character of man's free answer to God. To this tragic situation there can be but one solution: Christ. If the term "secular" would mean anything to Berdyaev, it would be the realm of rational freedom taken independently. Regardless, it is Christ who reconciles the meonic and rational freedom, by descending into the abyss, the *Ungrund*. By descending to the meonic, Christ cuts beneath the facile distinctions between good and evil, sacred and secular in our determined world and conquers the potentially evil meonic freedom by illuminating it from within.

There is no threat to the freedom of the created world in Christ's coming to it *via* the *Ungrund*; there is no application of external force in Him which could deprive the world of its freedom. In Christ a third kind of freedom is manifested, "a third kind of liberty which is a reconciliation of the other two kinds."<sup>31</sup> This new kind of freedom is that which proceeds not only from the divine nature of Christ, "but also from the human, and from his heavenly humanity."<sup>32</sup> It is precisely this divine-humanity which makes freedom "the inner creative energy of man,"<sup>33</sup> and

---

<sup>30</sup> Note Dostoevsky's "Grand Inquisitor" chapter of the *Brothers Karamazov*.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 135.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 139.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 121.

motivates Berdyaev to say:

Freedom has brought me to Christ, and I know no other way leading to Him. . . . I admit that it is grace which has brought me the faith, but it is grace experienced by me as freedom.<sup>34</sup>

and,

My freedom and my creative activity are my obedience to the sacred will of God.<sup>35</sup>

Freedom and creativity for Berdyaev are inseparable.

### III.

#### THE VISION OF INTEGRAL COSMIC TRANSFIGURATION

One of the most knowledgeable spokesmen for Russian Orthodoxy, N. Zernov of Oxford, offers us a good introduction to the Russian vision of integral cosmic transfiguration. He says:

The West treats man primarily as the citizen of an organized society. A Russian Christian sees himself rather as a son of mother earth. He is the summit of the animal and plant world and represents the most advanced expression of cosmic life. For the Orthodox the Church is not a society or an institution but the fullness of creation, the completion in Christ through the Holy Spirit of the Divine plan for the universe. The Church is Divine Wisdom, the plenitude, the pledge of the transfiguration of all beings and a source of victory over disunity, disease and death.<sup>36</sup>

Our present discussion is nothing more than a commentary on this observation and the following one also by Zernov:

The fundamental conviction of the Russian religious mind is the recognition of the potential holiness of matter, the unity and sacredness of the entire creation, and man's call

---

<sup>34</sup> Berdyaev, *Freedom and the Spirit*, p. x.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. xviii.

<sup>37</sup> Zernov, *Russian Religious Renaissance*, p. 285. The mystics referred to here include Boehme, Eckhart, Nicholas and Cusa.

<sup>38</sup> The chosen daughter of Mother Earth was seen to be the Virgin Mary.

to participate in the divine plan for its ultimate transfiguration. These ideas can be grouped under the name of Hagia Sophia, Holy Wisdom, the vision of which has never faded out in the long evolution of Russian Christianity. The concept of Divine Wisdom prophetically outlined in the Old Testament was only tentatively examined by the Byzantine theologians. It found some response among Western mystics, some of whom were recognized whilst others were rejected by the Church.<sup>37</sup>

The Russians associated Divine Wisdom with the God-bearer rather than with the Logos. In doing so they manifested their search for the link between Mary the Mother of the Incarnate God and Mother Earth.<sup>38</sup> The Virgin was felt to be the most pure of all humans, the one in whom the whole of creation could find a spokesman. The fallen universe recovered its image in Mary.<sup>39</sup>

Of all Russian thinkers Bulgakov has written most often and most unabashedly on Sophia. He first expounds this in a book called *Unfading Light* where he says St. Sophia is the boundary between God and the World, herself being neither the one nor the other. She receives love; she has nothing to give; she contains only that which she has taken. She is feminine and receptive; she is even called the Eternal Feminine.<sup>40</sup> Listen to how Bulgakov carries the Sophiological vision into his study entitled the *Philosophy of Economics*:

. . . We eat the created world, we commune with its flesh, not only through our mouths but through our digestive organs; not only through breathing with lungs and skin, but also through seeing, smelling, hearing and all the other senses. . . . Only because the entire universe is a living body is the existence of organisms, and their multiplication and nourishment, possible.

Man through his labor achieves a further stage in this process of assimilation by organic matter of its inorganic foundation. He differs from the rest of the animal world, who are conditioned by their instincts and always reproduce

---

<sup>39</sup> The icons assert something similar, i.e., that earthly things not merely reflect heavenly glory, but participate in the work of the Triune Creator.

<sup>40</sup> Note Lossky, *History of Russian Philosophy*, p. 206.

the same pattern in their dealings with the inorganic and vegetable world. Man plans his actions; he invents new patterns, and nature, being Sophianic, responds to the impact of his ideas, realized through the inventiveness of his mind and the skill of his labor. Nature is anthropomorphic; it recognizes itself in man; man discovers himself in Sophia, and through her he introduces the Divine Logos into nature.

. . . The world contains the flame of divine love, which however is concealed behind the seeming coarseness of matter. The purpose of its cosmic and historical evolution is to uncover the divine fire and make the entire creation shine with it. . . . The whole of creation is life; there is nothing dead in it, but the mask of death, as in a nightmare, has been imposed upon creation. . . . Man being at one with nature can bring back to life those energies which are dying in him, but he can do it only by revitalizing nature by changing matter into his own body, by tearing it away from its hardened skeleton and by warming it with his own flesh.<sup>41</sup>

For Bulgakov, in Sophia God repeats himself in creation. So the positive content of the world is not newly created by God; it is identical with the content which is already in God. The power of life and development in nature is the power of the Holy Spirit. Hence in *The Comforter* Bulgakov says:

One must understand and accept this natural grace of creation, inseverable from the natural world, without fearing apparent paganism or pantheism, the alternative to which is, in fact, empty and deadly deism, separating the Creator from the creature.<sup>42</sup>

Again the authorship of N. A. Berdyaev reflects a deep concern for what he calls the symbolical and objectified world. He asserts that compulsion and necessity reign in man's world; for this state of things, he says, man is responsible. According to Berdyaev, the material element in nature is only an objectification of living beings. The material elements which science in-

---

<sup>41</sup> Bulgakov, *The Philosophy of Economics*, quoted by Zernov, *Russian Religious Renaissance*, pp. 305-306.

<sup>42</sup> Bulgakov, S., *The Comforter*, quoted by N. O. Lossky, *History of Russian Philosophy*, p. 210.



vestigates bear the stamp of the Fall. To quote:

Man, the microcosm is responsible for the whole structure of nature and whatever takes place in man affects the whole of nature. Man gives life and spirit to nature through his creative freedom, and he kills or fetters it through his own servitude and his fall into material necessity. The fall of the highest hierarchical center of nature carries with it the fall of all nature, of all its lower ranks. The whole of creation groans and weeps and awaits its liberation.<sup>43</sup>

For Berdyaev, nature is to be led out of its torpidity by man's creativity. There is a paradox in man's relationship to nature: the act of human creation alone transcends the fallen state of nature and objectified time, but the materialization of creative activity once more re-introduces that which is objectified.

The creative act of the spirit is both an ascent and a descent. In its creative urge and flight, spirit rises above the world and dominates it, but the gravity of the world also drags it down and makes it conform in its products to the state of the world. The spirit establishes communication with the given state of the plural world precisely by objectifying itself in its creative products. In the process of being objectified the spirit helps to establish ties in the world in its fallen state. To Berdyaev this is the sphere of symbolization. In a sense the whole visible objective edifice can be considered to be a symbol of the spiritual world. In this sphere symbolization takes the place of realization. The person who is "completely and finally involved in the objectified world and in objectified activity fails to grasp or perceive the symbolical structure of which his is a part; and he regards himself as a realist. But symbolization and realization of the spirit are two different things"<sup>44</sup>

The natural world of phenomena is symbolic in character; it stands, according to Berdyaev, full of signs of another world and it is a symptom of division and alienation in the sphere of the spirit. However:

Objectification and the unauthentic character of the phenomenal world are by no means to be taken as meaning that the

---

<sup>43</sup> Berdyaev, *The Meaning of the Creative Act*, p. 71.

<sup>44</sup> Berdyaev, *Spirit or Reality*, p. 61.

world of men, women, animals, plants, minerals, stars, seas, forests, and so on are unreal and that behind it is something entirely unlike it — the things in themselves. It means rather that this world is in a spiritual and moral condition in which it ought not to be, it is in a state of servitude and loss of freedom.<sup>45</sup>

The world lives or dies by man; it is deadened by man's fall and revived by man's creative uprising. As was stated earlier, the all-vivifying and spiritualizing rise of fallen man is possible only through the Absolute-Man; it is Christ who brings man's nature into communion with divine nature. Berdyaev says:

Without Christ the Liberator, the world would have remained for all time shattered in necessity and determinism would be forever true.<sup>46</sup>

Most people know Berdyaev for his writings on ethics, the facet of his thought where his religious pulse is most easily taken. The foundation for his ethics of creativity and its relationship to the historical-cultural or secular context has been touched upon. These words of Berdyaev sum it up:

The Christian religion has placed man above the Sabbath, and the ethics of creativeness accepts this truth absolutely. Man is for it a value in himself, independently of the idea of which he is the bearer; our task in life is to radiate creative energy that brings with it light and strength and transfiguration. Hence the ethics of creativity does not pass judgement but gives life, receives life, heightens the quality and the value of life's contents. Its tragedy is connected with the conflict of values which are recognized as equally deserving of creative effort. Hence the ethics of creativeness inevitably presupposes sacrifice.<sup>47</sup>

In everything that Berdyaev says about the symbolical world lies his constant warning that it is much easier for man to sanctify life symbolically than to transfigure it. He says, "the fundamental principle of ethics may be formulated as follows: 'act so as to conquer death and affirm everywhere, in everything and in

---

<sup>45</sup> Berdyaev, *The Beginning and the End*, pp. 59-60.

<sup>46</sup> Berdyaev, *The Meaning of the Creative Act*, p. 151.

<sup>47</sup> Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man*, p. 138.

relation to all, eternal and immortal life.'"<sup>48</sup>

#### IV.

#### THE CHURCH AS IT IS RELATED TO CREATIVE FREEDOM AND COSMIC TRANSFIGURATION

Our final task is to integrate the two central thrusts of the Russian Religious Renaissance with more specific thought about the Church. If the East is to affect the West's thought about "Christianity and the secular" the touchstone will be ecclesiology. For Bulgakov,

Orthodoxy is the Church of Christ on earth. The Church of Christ is not an institution; it is a new life with Christ and in Christ, guided by the holy spirit.

Christians bear the name precisely because they belong to Christ, they live in Christ, and Christ lives in them. The Incarnation is not only an idea or a doctrine, it is above all an event which happened once in time but which possesses all the power of eternity, and this perpetual incarnation, a perfect indissoluble union, yet without confusion of the two natures — divine and human — makes the Church.<sup>49</sup>

And later he adds:

The essence of the Church is the divine life, revealing itself in the life of the creature by the power of the Incarnation and of Pentecost.<sup>50</sup>

Nicholas Berdyaev speaks in like fashion. As one might expect, Berdyaev asserts that the spiritual life of the community is best characterized by the concept of a creative Church. The Church, he says, cannot be understood from the outside because it is an inner reality. To quote:

The experience of the Church is *soborny*, for *sobornost* is one of its . . . qualities. In this experience I am not alone, for I am with all my brethren in the spirit in whatever place or time they may have lived.<sup>51</sup>

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 253.

<sup>49</sup> Bulgakov, S., *The Orthodox Church* (Century Press, London, 1935), p. 9.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>51</sup> Berdyaev, *Freedom and the Spirit*, p. 328.

Sobornost' can exist in the inwardness of a given diocese or church area. It is this vertical conception of universalism which Berdyaev feels best affirms the unity and ecumenicity of the Church in spite of its existing mechanical divisions. The Church to him is the order of love and freedom and represents their union. In the natural world love and freedom are not associated; freedom is opposed to unity; unity appears to mean little more than arbitrary restraint. The Church, however, knows nothing of this arbitrary restraining unity or unity opposing freedom.

It is upon tradition and succession that the life of the Church rests: man enters into the same spiritual world in each generation through tradition. To Berdyaev tradition is a *soborny* experience; it is the "creative spiritual life transmitted from generation to generation, uniting the living and the dead and thereby overcoming death. Death reigns in the world indeed but it is vanquished in the Church."<sup>52</sup> Resurrection, the victory over corruption, and the affirmation of eternal life are brought by tradition (which is creative memory). Tradition is not authority, but the creative life of the Spirit.

It is in the Church that the grass grows and the flowers blossom, for the Church is nothing but the cosmos Christianized. Christ entered the cosmos, He was crucified and rose again within it, and thereby all things were made new. The whole cosmos follows His footsteps to crucifixion and resurrection. . . . On integral conception of the Church is one in which it is envisaged as the Christianized cosmos.<sup>53</sup>

The Church does lead a divided existence; insofar as it belongs to the natural order it is only incompletely actualized. The Church, then, not only bears the signature of God, but also carries the mark of the world. The Church to Berdyaev is God-World, the God-humanity. There must be cosmic, terrestrial foundations for the Church; the world must itself welcome the coming of God. This last idea sets the stage for the statement of the reasons for Berdyaev's veneration of the Virgin Mary. As with Bulgakov, Mary is seen by Berdyaev to be pure nature constituting the cosmic foundation of the Church.

Berdyaev sees in the sacraments of the Church the prototypes

---

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 331-332.

of the transfiguration of the whole universe. Through the sacraments generally, and the liturgy particularly, the people have access to the very depths of the spiritual life. These sacraments operate where the sacrifice of Christ is effected, i.e., at the very deepest levels of cosmic life. The sacraments are visible expressions of the sacrifice which is operative in every one of life's phenomena. When one comes into the Church, Berdyaev believes, one enters upon the divine and eternal order of the world; in so doing man participates in the integral transfiguration of the world and history. The Church to Berdyaev is dynamic; it is a creative process; ultimately, it is the "universe baptized."<sup>54</sup>

The creative minds of the Russian Religious Renaissance, like those of Berdyaev and Bulgakov, were quite familiar with Western secular culture, but it was only in the years following the Marxist revolution that they came in personal contact with creative Western European minds. They were impressed by the tolerance Western scholars had for their opponents.<sup>55</sup> These Russians had been raised in the tradition of the Secular Order or intelligentsia which viewed its opponents as traitors. In this context conversation ceased between those who disagreed on points of ideology. In exile, also, they were touched by the more silent spiritual sources of European civilization; they faced more directly the complex problem of the disunity of the Church. Their conviction of the oneness of the Church, however was not shaken. Bulgakov asserted that the splits within the Church did not reach its foundations, and that in its sacramental life the Church was one.

May it not be that Christians now sin by not heeding the common Eucharistic call? The way towards reunion of East and West does not lie through tournaments between theologians, but through reunion before the altar.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Berdyaev, *The End of Our Time*, p. 108.

<sup>55</sup> Note: Zernov, N., *Russian Religious Renaissance*, pp. 250 ff.

<sup>56</sup> *Journal of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius*, No. 22, p. 8.

## CONCLUSION

One cannot doubt that the cultural and religious developments in Russia during the last one hundred years have had world-wide ramifications. It is evident, too, that the voices of the Russian Religious Renaissance will affect the whole of Christendom as it attempts to take creative shape in the age of the secular. However, the question as to just how his effect will come about is a quite open one. Possibly two facets of this question have been touched upon as this brief paper developed.

First of all, themes of creativity and freedom, nature and grace are emerging in many settings of Protestant and Roman Catholic counterpoints to the historical thrusts and movements of the "secular age." As this paper strongly hints, the West must admit to its lack of experience and maturity in dealing with these themes. Is there not some evidence that the West's way of intending the cosmos and thinking about man's freedom and creativity are qualified by a rather circumscribed set of conceptual and experiential equipment? Indeed, if theological frames of reference are replacing legalistic and categorical ones, if criteria of organicity and historical/natural interrelatedness are modes of thought and operation which are replacing the static, "objective" and doctrinaire, then the voice of the Russian Religious Renaissance will inevitably be heard because it embodies fresh visions. Two of the most basic of these visions we have attempted to describe; they are visions which are (in their contemporary form) offspring of a unique confrontation between Orthodoxy and the secular.

Secondly, the natural implication of this is that some of the West's traditional methods of approaching theological matters must be cracked open. For example, of what significant value would it be to measure the importance of a Khomyakov, a Bulgakov, or a Berdyaev with the yardstick of traditional Roman Catholic or Reformation doctrine, or worse yet from the perspective of the categorical commitment of a western philosophical system? Doing so would preclude the possibility of the West's seeing (to say nothing of being influenced by) the unique religious visions which shape Eastern thought. One must recognize, possibly, that the Western tradition until quite recently has not faced the issues which surround the nature/history relationship

and creative/freedom relationship, to which and out of which the Orthodox tradition speaks from long acquaintance, and too, that maybe one's task as a student of religion is to describe carefully allowing the uniqueness of the interrelationships of questions and answers in these various contexts to emerge, leaving open-ended all possibilities as to where that might lead.

CALIFORNIA LUTHERAN COLLEGE

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.



# The Greek Orthodox Theological Review

VOLUME XIII

NUMBER 1

SPRING, 1968



Published by the  
Holy Cross School of Theology  
Hellenic College  
Brookline, Massachusetts

Copyright 1968  
Hellenic College, Inc.



# The Greek Orthodox Theological Review

VOLUME XIII

NUMBER 1

SPRING, 1968



Published by the  
Holy Cross School of Theology  
Hellenic College  
Brookline, Massachusetts

Copyright 1968  
Hellenic College, Inc.

**Ideas and opinions expressed in any Article appearing in this REVIEW are those of the Author of the Article, and do not necessarily represent the ideas and opinions of the Editors.**

**Published by the Holy Cross School of Theology, Hellenic College  
50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146, U.S.A.**

**PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

# **THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW**

**Official Publication of the  
Holy Cross School of Theology  
Hellenic College**

**HIS EMINENCE ARCHBISHOP IAKOVOS,, Chairman, Board of Trustees  
THE REV. LEONIDAS C. CONTOS, President**

## **EDITOR**

**THE REV. DEMETRIOS J. CONSTANTELOS**

## **EDITORIAL BOARD**

**THE V. REV. M. AGHIORGOUSIS**

**GEORGE S. BEBIS**

**COSTAS M. PROUSSIS**

**THE REV. GEORGE J. TSOUMAS**

**THE REV. N. MICHAEL VAPORIS**

**DIMITRI ZAHAROPOULOS**

## **EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD**

**MILTON V. ANASTOS (University of California, Los Angeles)**

**GEORGE G. ARNAKIS (University of Texas)**

**PETER CHARANIS (Rutgers University)**

**DENO J. GEANAKOPOLOS (Yale University)**

**GEORGE A. PANICHAS (University of Maryland)**

**JOHN E. REXINE (Colgate University)**

**PETER TOPPING (University of Cincinnati)**



## THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW is a publication for the exchange of scholarly papers and reviews in the fields of Biblical Studies, Orthodox Theology, Church History, Byzantine History, and related Classical, Archaeological, and Philosophical Studies.

A subscription to the REVIEW costs five dollars per annum. The price of a single number is three dollars.

Communications to the Editor, books for review, requests for advertising and subscriptions, and notices of change of address should be directed to the Editor of THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Mass. 02146.

All MSS submitted for consideration by the REVIEW should be typewritten double-spaced; and all notes and documentation should be separately paged. Articles are approved for publication, or rejected, by the Editorial Boards. Rejected articles will be returned to the Author only if the latter has supplied a self-addressed stamped envelope.

The REVIEW is published twice yearly, Spring and Fall, by the Holy Cross School of Theology, Hellenic College, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Massachusetts 02146. It is indexed in *Historical Abstracts*, *Religious and Theological Abstracts*, and *The Index to Religious Periodical Literature*.

# THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XIII

SPRING, 1968

NUMBER I

## CONTENTS

### ARTICLES:

Theological Education for Mission

VASIL T. ISTAVRIDIS ..... 7

How Justinian I Sought to Handle the Problem of Religious Dissent

WILLIAM S. THURMAN ..... 15

A Synopsis of Eastern Orthodoxy and the Secular: A Historical Instance

DANIEL F. MARTENSEN ..... 41

The Essence of Orthodox Iconography

CONSTANTINE D. KALOKYRIS ..... 65

### BOOK REVIEWS:

*Synesios the Cyrenian*, by Melis Nicolaides

Reviewed by COSTAS M. PROUSSIS ..... 103

*Recordings of Byzantine Hymns*, by "Zoe" Brotherhood

Reviewed by SAVVAS I. SAVVAS ..... 104

*Morals in a Free Society*, by Michael Keeling

Reviewed by STANLEY S. HARAKAS ..... 105

*The Greek Orthodox Church: Faith, History and Practice*, by Demetrios J. Constantelos

Reviewed by VASIL T. ISTAVRIDIS ..... 107

*Ecumenism: The Spirit of Worship*, Leonard Swidler, ed.

Reviewed by GEORGE J. TSOUMAS ..... 109

*The Oriental Churches: Addis Ababa Conference, January 1965*, edited by the Interim Secretariat

Reviewed by GEORGE S. BEBIS ..... 111

*The Diary of a Russian Priest*, by Alexander Elchaninov.  
Translated by Helen Iswolsky

Reviewed by N. M. VAPORIS ..... 112

*The Old and New Man*, by Rudolph Bultmann. Translated  
by Keith R. Crim

Reviewed by THEODORE STYLIANOPOULOS ..... 112

BOOKS RECEIVED ..... 115

#### SUPPLEMENT:

A Study of the Ziskind MS, No. 22, Yale University  
Library

NOMIKOS M. VAPORIS ..... S-41



# BOOK REVIEWS

MELIS NICOLAIDES, *Synesios the Cyrenian*. A Historical Novel. In Greek. (Athens: Editions of "Pneumatike Zoe," 1967), pp. 254.

Melis Nicolaides is a well known modern Greek writer of many volumes of short stories and novels. In his earlier work he used a wide range of themes from contemporary life. But in the last ten years he has turned his attention to religious themes, using especially as his source of inspiration known or unknown persons who lived during the first few centuries of Christianity. His intention has been to re-create the life, the beliefs and sometimes the martyrdom of some of the first Christians. Such are his works *Cyprian the Magician* (1958), *At That Time* (1962), *Around Jesus* (1964), and his last book *Synesios the Cyrenian* (1967). In these four books, Mr. Nicolaides brings before our eyes the great or humble but honest and holy figures of that important period in all their Christian glory and humility. He also re-creates, as faithfully as he can, the general environment, the atmosphere, and the spirit of those times. The pure Christian belief of those simple people, their indomitable spirit of love and sacrifice, and their devotion to duty—duty to God and their fellow-men—spring forward in his work, refreshing and without affectation.

These characteristics prevail especially in *Synesios the Cyrenian*, which is an attempt to present, in the form of a historical novel, the life and deeds of one of the most interesting figures of that time. Synesios (c. 370-431), before becoming a Christian, was a writer, philosopher, mathematician, poet, and statesman. He tried to reconcile Platonism with Christianity; so he turned from idolatry to Christianity, and later became bishop of Ptolemais. Mr. Nicolaides in this historical novel depicts, vividly and colorfully, the life of the pagan and Christian Synesios—a life full of political and social activity, scientific endeavors, philosophical contemplation, tender love, and Christian practice. The narration is smooth and pleasant; the episodes are tightly woven so that they make an organic entity; and the characters, primary and even secondary, are clearly delineated and move with certainty and a sense of purpose.

But, as in his three earlier books, so in this last one, the main value of Mr. Nicolaides' work is not in its literary qualities but in the Christian message that it openly declares and unwaveringly follows as its guiding light. It is for this reason that these four books may be recommended as required reading not only for the young seminarians but for the Greek Orthodox faithful in general.

COSTAS M. PROUSSIS  
Hellenic College

"ZOE" BROTHERHOOD, *Recordings of Byzantine Hymns* (Athens, 1965).

The "Zoe" Brotherhood, a fraternal organization of Orthodox theologians, has recently undertaken the extremely useful project of making a series of recordings of Byzantine Sacred Hymns in order to offer to the wider public samples of the wealth of Orthodox Hymnology. To date the following records have appeared (in chronological order): the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom; selected hymns of the eight modes (as they are) chanted during the Vesper and Matin Services; representative hymns of Christmas, Epiphany, the Triodion and Great Lent; hymns chanted on Holy Tuesday, Easter and Pentecost; and, finally, a variety of hymns taken from the Feastday of the Dormition of the Theotokos, the Small Paraclesis Service, the First and Second Exaposteilaria with their corresponding Doxastika, the Third and Fourth Doxastika with their corresponding Exaposteilaria, the Doxology in the third mode by Manuel and Iakovos the choirmasters, the Polyeleoi and selected hymns of the second and third modes.

All these hymns were chanted by two Byzantine choirs and two non-Byzantine, that is, a three-voice and a four-voice choir. This reviewer will, on the basis of his competency, limit his remarks to the rendition of hymns by the Byzantine choirs.

The first Byzantine choir consists of members of the Panhellenic Association of Chanters "Romanos Melodos" and "John Damascene" under the direction of Antonios Belousis, president of the Association. The second Byzantine choir is comprised of numerous chanters under the direction of Spyridon Peristeris, the choirmaster of the Cathedral of Athens, who occasionally chants solo.

In this series of records the sequence of hymns is not followed faithfully according to the eight modes, but one should take into consideration the fact that not all modes are represented in the hymns of the previously mentioned services. It is the opinion of this reviewer that if various hymns of the eight modes were chanted in sequence, followed by other hymns, the presentation on the whole would have been more complete, especially with the addition of a brief commentary on Byzantine Music and its history on the back of the record covers. Outside of Greece and the Middle East, Byzantine Music, granted its rich musical texture, needs introductory remarks and succinct statements on the origin, establishment and perpetuation of the eight modes in Orthodox Worship. There is also a relationship between the eight modes and the various hymns, and the role of the eight modes in the formation of Orthodox Worship should be taken into account. The chief attraction of the present records is the musical dimension of Byzantine Hymnology.

The two Byzantine choirs chant strictly the traditional Byzantine melody which is monophonic. The *isokratema*, a very significant element in Byzantine Music, gives body to the melody, yet creates a delicate, highly sensitive overall effect. It is a feature which tests the talent of the performer and all the more so when a large choir is involved. With regard to the present recordings, both Byzantine choirs measure up to the test;

pp. 63-67; chapter four: The Mysteries of the Church, pp. 68-75; chapter five: The Worship of the Church, pp. 76-83; chapter six: Other Sacraments, pp. 84-89; chapter seven: Traditional Practices in Orthodoxy, pp. 90-101; chapter eight: A Church of Saints and Holy Fathers, pp. 102-106; chapter nine: A Church of Optimism and Hope, pp. 107-113; chapter ten: The Church in America, pp. 114-124; and selected bibliography, pp. 125-127.

The author, dealing with actual or probable queries of Orthodox and non-Orthodox college students and educated laymen (p. 7), as well as taking into account certain charges against the Orthodox Church, gives the appropriate replies clearly and firmly. He defends the Orthodox Church attempting, consciously or unconsciously, always to present the best aspects of the Church Militant; occasionally he employs a rhetorical style (pp. 112-113). But elements of self-criticism are not absent (p. 47, p. 98). In this book, direct citations are placed in quotes, but without precise reference to works and pages quoted. Also names of figures and places are not rendered in the customary Latin form but rather are transliterated from the Greek into English (pp. 28, 38, 39, 41, 42, 47, 65, 82, 106).

When referring to the Orthodox Church, preference is given to the terms "Greek Orthodox Church" or "Orthodox Catholic Church." Attention is drawn frequently and with special interest to the Orthodox contributions in the sphere of social and philanthropic activity. "Philanthropy" is the embracing term which is employed to express the love toward our fellow men which is confirmed by action ((pp. 24, 42-43, 53-54, 58-61, 107-113). The specifically historical portion of the work covers a good many pages (pp. 31-62). The author distinguishes four periods in Church History: the Apostolic and ancient period (1st through 3rd centuries); the Medieval period (4th through 15th centuries); the period under the Turkish yoke (15th century to 1830); and the modern period (1830 through the present). We customarily acknowledge that the first two of the Ecumenical Councils deal with the Trinitarian Dogma, whereas the subsequent Councils deal with the Christological Dogma (p. 40). In the modern period special attention is drawn to the history of the Patriarchates of Constantinople (known as Ecumenical), Alexandria and Jerusalem, as well as to the autocephalous Churches of Cyprus and Greece and to the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America. In reference to the Ecumenical Patriarchate, laudatory mention is made of His Holiness, the Patriarch Athenagoras. Concerning the Church of Greece in the postwar years, three factors are emphasized; religious education, social consciousness and theological studies. In pp. 56-57 the spiritual awakening resulting from various religious movements including *Apostoliki Diaconia* is said to have saved the nation from communism. The chapter on the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America deals primarily with the question of the recognition of Orthodoxy in America as the fourth "major faith" next to Protestantism, Roman Catholicism and Judaism. Remarks on the relationship between Roman Catholicism and Orthodoxy may be found on pp. 26-27, 30, 43-46; on the Ecumenical Movement, pp. 52, 62, 99-100, 113; and

on the controversial issues of mixed marriages, abortion and birth control, pp. 87-88.

This work, with its studied content and neat appearance, despite some typographical errors, fills a void and serves well the purpose for which it was written.

VASIL T. ISTAVRIDIS  
*Theological School of Halki*

*Ecumenism: The Spirit and Worship*, edited by Leonard Swidler. (Pittsburg, Pa.; Duquesne University Press, 1967), pp. 258.

This is a collection of essays that were chosen to be printed as a result of a number of Ecumenical Seminars and a Symposium. Since 1961, the Roman Catholic University of Duquesne, together with the Pittsburgh Presbyterian Theological Seminary, has offered annually a graduate seminar in Ecumenism. In 1963 the theme of the seminar revolved around *Ecumenism and Liturgy and Worship*. The following year it was *Ecumenism and Spirituality*. The students attending were both Roman Catholics and Protestants, and the guest speakers represented a variety of Christian Churches. In the spring of 1965, the editorial staff of the *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* and the Department of Theology of Duquesne University sponsored a public and closed Symposium and the theme, *Ecumenism and the Modern World*.

The papers read and the discussion that followed at this Symposium reinforced the idea that there was a relationship and in actuality an interconnection between Ecumenism, the Holy Spirit and Worship. Although at first glance these three topics appear antithetical, they are interrelated, so much in fact that, as it was learned, if they are isolated from each other, they become distorted and wither. Ecumenism which seeks unity through the Spirit affects Christian communal worship.

There are four essays on *Ecumenism* presented by well known writers: Robert McAfee Brown, a Presbyterian and Director of Special Programs in Humanities, Stamford University, examines "What Is Ecumenism and Why" (pp. 15-37); Bernard J. Cooke, a Roman Catholic Jesuit and Chairman of the Theology Department of Marquette University, presents "Ecumenism and the Unbeliever" (pp. 38-49); Franklin H. Littell, a Methodist and President of Iowa Wesleyan College, discusses "Ecumenism in the World Map" (pp. 50-61); George A. Lindbeck, a Lutheran and Associate Professor of Historical Theology at Yale University, writes on "Ecumenism, Cosmic Redemption and the Council" (pp. 62-79).

Five essays are included on the *Spirit*. William McNamara, a Roman Catholic, who was founder and director of the Spiritual Life Institute of America, investigates "The Heart of Ecumenism" (pp. 83-97); Frank van het Hof, a brother of Taizé, a Protestant group started after World War II, speaks on "Towards an Ecumenical Spirituality" (pp. 98-110); Douglas Steere, a Quaker and Emeritus Professor of Philosophy at Haver-

ford College, presents "Ecumenism and Spirituality" (pp. 111-125); Robert Betram, a Lutheran and Associate Professor of Systematic and Historical Theology at Concordia Seminary, examines "Spirituality Is for Angels—the Angels of Michael" (pp. 126-169); Bernard J. Cooke, a Roman Catholic Jesuit scholar, presents "The Holy Spirit and Authority" (pp. 170-182).

Three final essays on *Worship* complete the collection. Helene Isworsky, a Russian Orthodox and Professor of Russian Literature, Seton Hall College, discusses "The Holy Spirit in Russian Orthodox Devotional Life" (pp. 185-214); David G. Buttrick, a Presbyterian and Assistant professor, Church and Ministry Division, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, examines "The Renewal of Worship—a Source of Unity?" (pp. 215-236); James F. White, a Methodist and Assistant Professor of Worship, Southern Methodist University, investigates "Motivation for Worship in Protestantism" (pp. 237-258).

These writers, coming from different Churches, no doubt reflect generally their Church's viewpoint, but they are not timid about discussing their own ideas, too. They agree to disagree. They agree especially on these points: that before some semblance of Christian unity can be attained, many obstacles must be overcome, and many dangers such as distrust, suspicion, fear, etc.; that the future of togetherness from a human viewpoint seems impossible, but since the Holy Spirit is at work "we can be confident that He will bring to His own kind of fulfillment even our feeblest hopes and deeds and prayers" (Brown); that every individual Christian is a member of the Universal Church and "as members of the Body of Christ, we have to cry a word of hope to mankind by our works and deeds" (Van het Hof); that "if there is any conflict between authority and the Spirit, it can be apparent and due to our human misunderstandings" (Cooke); that the Liturgical Movement is stronger today than it has ever been in the past and may well as a corrective worship that has become oddly invertly impoverished" (Buttrick); that the Paraclete is drawing nearer to mankind. For as East and West "re-examine their theology and their ecclesiology, the extreme points of opposition gradually fade, while the Great Truths of Christian doctrine emerge out of the misunderstandings" (Isworsky).

Valuable ecumenical material has been gathered in this collection of essays which can serve as a constant reminder of how far we have gone on our road towards unity. As one of the writers states: "For a long time we have hated each other. Then we ignored one another. Then we began talking *about* one another. Then we began talking *to* one another. Then we began praying *for* one another. And now we are beginning to pray *with* one another. And when *that* is a fact, no one can safely erect barriers where the relationship may go from here" (Brown).

GEORGE J. TSOUMAS  
*Hellenic College*

*The Oriental Orthodox Churches: Addis Ababa Conference, January 1965.*  
Edited by the Interim Secretariat, Oriental Orthodox Conference.  
(Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Artistic Printers, August 1965), pp. 142.

This is a welcomed book in which the reader is informed of the Conference of the "Oriental Orthodox Churches" held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in January of 1965. With the term "Oriental Orthodox Churches" one should recognize the Monophysite Churches of the East which, as it is stated in the Introduction, remained loyal to the Alexandrine theological tradition as it had been declared by the Council of Ephesus in 431. These Churches renounce the Council of Chalcedon (451) because, as they claim, it practically contradicted the Council of Ephesus.

The Conference was convened by the Emperor of Ethiopia, Haile Selassie I, and the following Oriental Churches took part in it: The Coptic Orthodox Church of Alexandria, the Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch and all the East, the Armenian Orthodox Patriarchates, the Ethiopian Orthodox Church and the Syrian Orthodox Church of India. Actually, it was the first meeting of the Oriental Churches after the split resulted from the Council of Chalcedon.

The book contains the speeches of the Emperor of Ethiopia and of the heads of the divergent delegations as well as a short historical background of each of the participant Churches. The book also includes the decisions of the Conference, and of particular interest is the paragraph concerning the relations with Eastern Orthodox Churches (of the Byzantine tradition). The Conference suggests a fresh study of the Christological doctrine in its historical setting and recommends cooperation in practical affairs. It recommends also dialogues with the Roman Catholic Church and its participation in the World Council of Churches. The Conference dealt also with practical matters, i.e. with Christian Education, the Monastic life, the Church Calendar (some of the participant Churches had already adopted the Gregorian Calendar), Church Administration and pastoral care.

In many pages there is apparent the nostalgia for the unity of the Church which existed in the East before the Council of Chalcedon. In recent theological consultations, however, both the Orthodox Eastern Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches through their clergymen and scholars expressed the idea that the division of the Church in the East after the Council of Chalcedon was due to misunderstandings of the terminology used, and that a careful analysis of the Conciliar and Patristic documents and texts could prove that the Christological doctrines of both sides do not present in reality any profound difference and that a dialogue which could lead to the reunion of the two Churches is encouraged from both sides. Indeed, it is of paramount importance that such a union be achieved, because after such a union the dialogue with the Western Churches will be more profitable and more than desirable.

GEORGE S. BEBIS  
*Hellenic College*

## BOOKS RECEIVED

- JAMES A. MOHLER, S.J., *The Beginning of Eternal Life* (New York, 1968), 144 pages, \$4.95.
- AARON J. UNGERSMA, *The Search for Meaning, A New Approach in Psychotherapy* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968), 188 pages, \$1.95.
- J. STANLEY CHESNEST, *The Old Testament Understanding of God* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968), 192 pages, \$2.45.
- JAMES KALLAS, *Jesus and the Power of Satan* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968), 215 pages, \$6.00.
- THEO WESTOW, *Introducing Contemporary Catholicism* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968), 127 pages, \$1.65.
- QUIRIMUS BREEN, *Christianity and Humanism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), 283 pages, \$6.95.
- OSCAR CULLMANN, *The New Testament, An Introduction for the General Reader* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968), 138 pages, \$1.95 paperbound.
- MICHAEL KEELING, *Morals in a Free Society* (New York: Seabury Press, 1968), 159 pages, \$3.50.
- WILLIAM NICHOLLS, editor, *Conflicting Images of Man* (New York: Seabury Press, 1968), vi + 231 pages, \$2.95 paperbound.
- W. NORMAN PITTENGER, *Reconceptions in Christian Thinking 1817-1967* (New York: Seabury Press, 1968), 127 pages, \$4.50.
- THOMAS M. FINN, *The Liturgy of Baptism in the Baptismal Instructions of St. John Chrysostom*, Studies in Christian Antiquity, No. 15 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1967), 229 pages, \$4.95 paperbound.
- NIKOLITSAS D. GEORGOPOULOU, *Ἡ Ἀγιότης τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἐξ Ὁρθοδόξου Ἐπόψεως* (Athens, 1967), 141 pages.
- JACQUES DUPIS, S.J., *L'Esprit de l'Homme: Etude sur l'anthropologie religieuse d'Origène* (Bruges, Belgium, 1967), xviii + 208 pages, 201 Fr.
- DAGOBERT D. RUNES, *The War Against the Jew* (New York, 1968), xxiv + 192 pages, \$6.00.
- RUDOLF BULTMANN, *The Old and the New Man* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1967), 79 pages, \$1.50 paperbound.
- RICHARD STAUFFER, *Luther as Seen by Catholics*, Ecumenical Studies in

History, No. 7 (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1967), 83 pages, \$1.95 paperbound.

JOHN WEBSTER GRANT, *The Canadian Experience of Church Union*, Ecumenical Studies in History, No. 8 (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1967), 106 pages, \$1.95 paperbound.

ALEXANDER ELCHANINOV, *The Diary of a Russian Priest* (London: Faber and Faber, 1967), 255 pages, 45 s.

ATHANASIOS K. ARVANITES, 'Επίτομος 'Ιστορία Συρο-Ίακωβιτικῆς, 'Αρμενικῆς καὶ Αἰθιοπικῆς Ἐκκλησίας (Athens, 1967), 128 pages.

JOHN JOSEPH STOUT, *Jacob Boehme, His Life and Thought* (New York: Seabury Press, 1968), 317 pages, \$2.75.

ROBERT F. EVANS, *Pelagius: Inquiries and Reappraisals* (New York: Seabury Press, 1968) xiv+171 pages, \$6.95.







A STUDY OF THE ZISKIND MS No. 22  
YALE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

NOMIKOS M. VAPORIS  
(Continued from Vol. XII. 3)

No. XIII. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF GRAND  
SKEVOPHYLAX JOHN

ὁμολογία.

Official copy.

10 November 1674

Grand Skevophylax John borrows 519 *aslania* from Malouses, the Protonotarios of the Metropolis of Adrianople. Former Patriarch Parthenios (now *Proedros* of Adrianople) guarantees the loan made without interest "for the sake of friendship."

Terms: twenty days.

Signed and sealed by: † Grand Skevophylax John.

Guaranteed by: † Patriarch Parthenios, *Proedros* of Adrianople.<sup>1</sup>

John Karyophylles has changed his seal as Grand Skevophylax. It is oblong in shape, 1.6 by 1.3 cm., with what appears to be a classical statue on its face. There is no discernible inscription.

No. XIII, *verso* indicates that the loan was paid on 5 December of the same year.

---

1. In the literature examined for this study, the present document and No. XIX below are the only two references to Patriarch Parthenios IV as *Proedros* of Adrianople; in all, Parthenios held the office of *proedros* six different times, and the office of patriarch five times. His ecclesiastical chronology may be reconstructed as follows:

Metropolitan of Bursa, January 1655 to April 1657,  
Ecumenical Patriarch, 1 May 1657 to 19 June 1662,  
*Proedros* of Bursa, after 19 June 1662,  
Ecumenical Patriarch, 21 October 1665 to 9 September 1667,  
*Proedros* of Proilavo (Braila), after 9 September 1667,  
*Proedros* of Tirnovo, after Proilavo,  
Ecumenical Patriarch, March 1671 to 7 September 1671,  
*Proedros* of Adrianople, cited on 10 November 1674,  
Ecumenical Patriarch, 1 January 1675 to 29 July 1676,  
*Proedros* of *Anchialos*, 17 December 1676 to (?),  
*Proedros* of Adrianople, cited on 24 November 1677, and  
Ecumenical Patriarch, 10 March 1684 to March 1685.

In the Ottoman period, due to new conditions, the title *proedros* acquired a new definition and a special status unknown previously in the history of the Orthodox Church. This change occurred, not through any regular ecclesiastical legislation, but κατ' οἰκονομίαν (by special dispensation). An excellent work on *oikonomia* is A. Alivizatos, *Ἡ Οἰκονομία κατὰ τὸ Κανονικὸν Δίκαιον τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας* (Athens, 1949).

Previously, the term was used synonymously with that of bishop or metropolitan. Eusebius, St. Basil, Socrates, the Acts of the Fourth Ecumenical Council and many others have used it with this definition. For a complete list of these examples, see E. Alexandrides, «Πρόεδρος, τὸν τόπον ἐπέχων», *Ὁρθοδοξία*, II (1927), pp. 199-202, 254-56.

A *proedros* was appointed whenever one or more of the following conditions prevailed: (1) whenever the bishop's own diocese was unable to support him and new revenues were necessary, (2) whenever a patriarch or bishop was expelled from his own see and required a position to support himself, and (3) whenever a diocese, whose bishop had died, resigned, or was expelled could no longer support another prelate. In all these instances the diocese or metropolis acquired by a *proedros* was without its own canonical head; *ibid.*, p. 287.

Usually, the *proedros* of such a diocese would merely send his representative to collect the revenues. Often, however, the *proedros* would personally perform all the duties of a canonical bishop. There are even instances when a bishop would move his headquarters from his canonical diocese to that acquired as *proedros*; *ibid.*, p. 341.

The title *proedros* was also assumed whenever a prelate received a diocese or metropolis lower in rank from his previous one, or whenever he was translated more than three times. The latter consideration was based upon the Orthodox concept that a bishop "married" his diocese, and since only three marriages are permitted in the Church, only three translations were considered "proper." On the fourth translation, therefore, the prelate always assumed the title *proedros* instead of the name of the see; S. Salaville, "Le titre ecclésiastique de *proedros* dans les documents byzantins," *Echos D'Orient*, XXIX (1930), pp. 416-36, especially p. 435. Briefly, we can say that the institution of *proedros* was a realistic and practical solution (in many instances) to the new conditions brought about by Ottoman rule,

although the practice had begun during the more turbulent periods of Byzantine rule. The institution of *proedros* was also an attempt not to violate the fundamental tradition and ruling of the Church that a bishop could only be the ecclesiastical head of one ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

#### NO. XIV. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF EZEKIEL OF TIRNOVO

ὁμολογία.

Official copy.

1 September 1675<sup>1</sup>

Metropolitan Ezekiel borrows 1,480 *aslania* from Grand Skevophylax John, for diocesan needs.

Terms: one year, twenty per cent thereafter on the unpaid balance. Ezekiel also promises to pay the expenses of a loan collector if the Skevophylax is forced to send one.

Confirmed by: † Patriarch Parthenios.<sup>2</sup>

Signed and sealed by: † Ezekiel, humble Metropolitan of Tirnovos.<sup>3</sup>

Witnessed by: † Neophytos of Nicomedia † Damascene of Nicaea<sup>4</sup> † Anthimos of Athens † Laurentios [Lawrence] of Monemvasia<sup>5</sup> † Daniel of Anchialos<sup>6</sup> † Kallinikos of Crete<sup>7</sup> † Theodosios of Lititza [Litića]<sup>8</sup> † Methodios of Drystras † John Mavrogordatos<sup>9</sup> † Kyrillos of Jannina † Neophytos of Chios<sup>10</sup> and Loukakes [Luke] Veveles.

Ezekiel's seal is circular, 2.4 cm. in diameter, with a double-headed eagle in the center. The border inscription reads: Ο ΤΑΠΕΙΝΟΣ [ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ] ΤΟΡΝΟΒΟΥ ΕΖΕΚΙΗΛ 1673.

---

1. Although the date appearing in the document is 1 September 1674, it should be dated 1 September 1675. A close examination of the text shows that the last letter indicating the date has been written over. Furthermore, all authorities (Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 587; Grumel, *Chronologie*, p. 439; Germanos, *Katalogoi*, p. 361; Gennadios, *Photieios*, I, 213) terminate Gerasimos' patriarchate at the end of December 1674 and begin Parthenios' fourth patriarchate on January 1675.

Why anyone would want to change the date of the document is a mystery.

2. This is Parthenios IV. See No. IX, note 1.

3. Ezekiel, bishop of Lophtzou, succeeded Gerasimos of Tir-

novo two days after the latter became Ecumenical Patriarch on 14 August 1673; Gennadios, *Photieios*, I, 213, note 45. Ezekiel is also attested in No. XV, dated 22 March 1677, but in No. XVIII, dated 1 August 1677, a Daniel (not cited in episcopal lists) appears as Metropolitan of Tirnovo. Consequently, Ezekiel's dates are 16 August 1673 to sometime between 22 March and 1 August 1677. Germanos (*Thrake*, II, 179) offers Athanasios, cited in 1689, as the possible successor to Ezekiel, but he is unaware of Daniel.

4. The present city of Iznik. Nicaea, scene of the First (325) and Seventh (787) Ecumenical Councils, as well as the seat of the Byzantine Empire and Patriarchate from 1204-1261, has been a metropolis since 451; Konidares, *Metropoleis*, pp. 26-27.

Metropolitan Damascene was elected on 12 July 1662 (*Sathas*, III, 59). He resigned shortly before 1 February 1676 and was succeeded by Sophronios; *ibid.*, 601.

5. Monemvasia (in the Peloponnesos) became a diocese in the first half of the eighth century and was subject to the Metropolis of Corinth; Konidares, *Metropoleis*, p. 57. As a metropolis in the Ottoman period, it had eight suffragan dioceses; Papadopoulos, *Studies*, pp. 115-16.

Metropolitan Laurentios is also attested in 1672; Gennadios, *Photieios*, I, 178.

6. Anchialos (Anchialo) in present day Bulgaria was a diocese in the second century (*Atlas*, p. 186), an archdiocese in the middle of the sixth century (Konidares, *Metropoleis*, pp. 70-71), and a metropolis in the fourteenth century; *Dictionnaire*, IV, 1512.

Daniel of Anchialos is attested as early as 1671 (Delikanes, *Engrapha*, III, 342; Karmires, *Mnemeia*, II, 694; Gedeon, *Chronika*, p. 114; *Dictionnaire*, IV, 1513), and as late as May 1697 (Delikanes, *Engrapha*, II, 452; *Sathas*, III, 408). His successor, the former bishop of Metra, Makarios, was elected 28 April 1700; Germanos, *Thrake*, II, 122; *Θ.Η.Ε.*, I, 337.

Patriarch Parthenios IV interrupted Daniel's term of office by being appointed *Proedros* of Anchialos in December 1676 (Gedeon, *Pinakes*, 598; Zerlentes, *Ephemerides*, p. 294), that is, after his fourth patriarchate (January 1675 to 29 July 1676); *Sathas*, III, 602; also see Germanos, *Katalogoi*, 145, 148.

7. Originally part of the Exarchate of Eastern Illyricum and subject to Rome, Crete remained under the Pope until 733. There-

after, Crete was a part of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, although during the Venetian occupation of the island (1212-1645), the Venetians discouraged the election of Orthodox bishops and metropolitans. Only under Ottoman domination did Crete function uninhibited as a metropolis of the Patriarchate with twelve subordinate dioceses.

According to *Dictionnaire* (XIII, 1033-37), Metropolitan Kallinikos' dates are: beginning of 1683 to the beginning of 1687. According to the same source, he was preceded by Neophytos Patelarios (1652-1679), the first Orthodox Metropolitan after the expulsion of the Venetians, and Nicephoros II Skotakes (1679-1683). Therefore, No. XIV of our MS, dated 1 September 1675 or even 1674, creates a problem of chronology with regard to the above metropolitan.

8. Litića in present day Bulgaria (originally a diocese subject to Philippopolis) was one of the twenty-four archdioceses under the immediate jurisdiction of the Patriarchate; Papadopoulos, *Studies*, p. 118,

Archbishop Theodosios, formerly protosynkellos of Didymoteichon (Gedeon, *Ephemerides*, 108; Germanos, *Thrake*, II, 149), was elected 7 February 1652 (Germanos, *Thrake*, II, 149; *Sathas*, III, 586, 1663) and is attested as late as 15 March 1681 (Lampros, *Dyo Sigillia*, p. 111). He appears again in Nos. XVII and XXII of the MS. He is cited as late as May 1681; Gennadios, *Photieios*, II, 6; Delikanes, *Engrapha*, III, 342; and Eustratiades, *Athos*, III, 54.

9. Chios is cited as a diocese subject to the Metropolis of Rhodes in the eighth century; Konidares, *Metropoleis*, p. 72. It probably became an archdiocese in the reign of Andronikos III (1328-41), and a metropolis in August 1343; *Dictionnaire*, XII, 744.

Neophytos is first attested in 1672. He died shortly after witnessing the above note (Amantos, *Chios*, p. 55) and was succeeded by Patriarch Gerasimos as *proedros*. In May 1676, Gregory became metropolitan of Chios; *Sathas*, III, 601.

10. John Mavrokordatos or as he signs, John Mavrogordatos, also appears as a witness in Nos. XXV and XXV *verso*. As Grand Dragoman, Alexander Mavrokordatos received the revenues of various provinces. When the island of Mykonos (in the Aegean) was given to him, he appointed his brother as his reve-

nue agent; Amantos, *Mavrokordatos*, p. 341. Very little else is known concerning John.

## NO. XV. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF EZEKIEL OF TIRNOVO

ὁμολογητικὸν γράμμα.

Official copy.

22 March 1677.

To assist Ezekiel of Tirnovo, who had lost jurisdiction over the income of his province because of financial difficulties, Grand Logothetes John<sup>1</sup> agrees to accept a lower interest rate (ten per cent) on monies owed to him by the Metropolitan. Similar terms are also accepted by Ezekiel's other creditors. In addition, Ezekiel agrees to pay John as much as possible on the principal and past interest of 1,500 and 470 *grosia*, respectively, until he regains financial control of his province.

Signed and sealed by: † Ezekiel, humble Metropolitan of Tirnovo.

Seal is identical with that in No. XIV.

---

1. In the Byzantine period the office of Grand Logothetes was not an ecclesiastical, but a governmental office; see Papadopoulos, *Studies*, pp. 83-84. As an ecclesiastical office, it is first attested in the sixteenth century; Rhallès, *Logothetes*, p. 156. But despite its late appearance, this office made its way not only into the ranks of the *exokatakoiloi* (the six highest offices), but assumed the first rank among all the *officia* of the Patriarchate.

The Grand Logothetes was the only official among the first twenty-one in rank who did not perform regular secretarial duties; Gedeon, *Chronika*, p. 210. Instead, his duties were to translate the Patriarch's enthronement message and transmit it to the Sultan; to handle all correspondence from the former to the latter; to receive the official confirmation from the Sultan (after 1657 from the Grand Vizier) of the election of a new Patriarch; to participate in Patriarchal funerals; to stand on the right of the Patriarch (outside the sanctuary) when the latter officiated at the Divine Liturgy; and to recite the "Creed" and the "Our Father" during the same service; Rhallès, *Logothetes*, pp. 160-62.

Papadopoulos (*Studies*, p. 83) accepts 1721 as the probable date after which the Grand Logothetes superseded the Grand Oikonomos in rank. However, if we assume, as I believe we should, that Delikanès transcribed the names of the officials in



the order in which they appeared in the documents edited by him, then we note that (a) in a Synodical letter issued by Patriarch Jeremiah II, and dated 1575, Grand Oikonomos Anastasios, the priest, signs before the Grand Logothetes Hierax (Delikanes, *Engrapha*, II, 337); (b) in a *tomos* issued by Patriarch Parthenios I, and dated May 1641, Grand Logothetes Laskaris signs before the Grand Oikonomos Christodoulos, the priest; *ibid.*, I, 292. It would seem, therefore, that the actual change took place earlier than its formal recognition in 1721.

Grand Logothetes John is John Karyophylles, promoted to this office from Grand Skevopyhlax on 5 December 1676 by Patriarch Dionysios IV; Zerlentes, *Ephemerides*, p. 294. Also see No. III, note 3 above.

## No. XVI. A SALES CONTRACT

αὐθεντικὴ καὶ καθολικὴ ὁμολογία. Copy. 24 April 1677.

With the advice and consent of his boyars, John Doukas, Voevode of Hungro-Vlachia [Wallachia], farms out to Grand Logothetes John and Drakos Eupragiotes<sup>1</sup> the right to supply food provisions destined for the Ottomans.

Signed by: † John Doukas Voevode<sup>2</sup> † Banos [Ban] Kirkas<sup>3</sup> † Grand Logothetes Serbanos<sup>4</sup> † Grand Klotziarēs [Clucer] Giovaskos<sup>5</sup> † Grand Stolikos [Stolnic] Constantine<sup>6</sup> † Grand Komisos [Comis] Vladoul<sup>7</sup> † Sertares (Setrar) Radoul<sup>8</sup> † Grand Vornikos [Vornic] Voulkoilos<sup>9</sup> † Grand Banos Radoul † Grand Vistiars [Vistier] Chrezas<sup>10</sup> † Grand Bacharnikos [Paharnic] Stagikos<sup>11</sup> † Klotziarēs Bates † Pitares [Pitar] Demetraskos.<sup>12</sup>

The text is headed by the Voevode's *monokondylion*.<sup>13</sup>

1. Probably a brother of Demetrios Eupragiotes and a relative of the Rossetos family. Drakos appears in Nos. XXIV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII *verso*, LXI, and LII.

2. Also appears in Nos. XXIV, XL, and XLI of the MS. Doukas ruled Moldavia thrice: 1666-67; 1669-72; and 1678-84, and Wallachia from 1674 to 1678. He died a captive among the Poles; see Cantemir, *History*, p. 264, note 14.

3. Ban means administrator. The word is of Old Slavonic origin and was used originally in the Principalities as a title for governor (Mare Ban) of a province (e.g. Oltenia). Later, a title assumed by the boyars of Wallachia (Ban al Craiovei); *Dictio-*

*narul Limbii Romine Moderne*, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romane (Bucuresti, 1958), p. 66.

4. Of Byzantine Greek origin meaning secretary. However, this title did not reach the Principalities directly from Byzantium, but via Bulgaria; A. D. Xénopol, *Histoire des Roumains de la Dacie Trajane: Depuis les origines jusqu'à l'union des principautés en 1859* (Paris, 1896), I, p. 231. In Wallachia, the Chancellor and Keeper of the great seal.

5. From the Old Slavonic *Kljucar*. A boyar responsible for the provisions of the Court. A steward or *oikonomos*; *Dictionarul*, p. 160.

6. From the Old Slavonic *Stolniku*. A boyar responsible for the court dinners. In extension, he supervised the court cooks, gardeners, and fishermen; *ibid.*, p. 80.

7. From the Latin *Comes*. A boyar responsible for the prince's stables; a Master of the Horse; *ibid.*, p. 170.

8. Master of the Guards.

9. From the Old Slavonic *Dvorniku*, judge. The chief administrator of justice; *Dictionarul*, p. 941.

10. From the Latin *vestiarius*, Old Slavonic *vistiaria*, treasury. The financial administrator of the Principality and supervisor of the state treasury. A Minister of Finance; *ibid.*, p. 933.

11. Of Old Slavonic origin, *Pabar* means cup and *Pabarnic* a cupbearer, therefore, a boyar whose responsibility it was to pour wine into the Prince's cup. By extension, the *Pabarnic* was also responsible for the vineyards, the collection of wine, and the wine cellars belonging to the Prince; *ibid.*, p. 577.

12. A baker, that is, a boyar charged with the responsibility of providing bread for the princely court and army. Also director of state bakeries. A superintendent of the Prince's equipages; *ibid.*, p. 621; also see William Wilkinson, *An Account of the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia: Including Various Political Observations Relating to Them* (London, 1820), pp. 51-56; and Xénopol, *op. cit.*, pp. 229-33; and *Enciclopedia României* (Bucharest, 1938), I, pp. 272-74.

13. Ἰω(άννης) ἐλέω Θ(εο)ῦ δοῦκ(ας) βοεβόνας αὐθέντ(ης) πάσ(ης) οὐγκροβλαχία(ας).

NO. XVII. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF DANIEL  
OF TIRNOVO

ὁμολογία.

Official copy.

1 August 1677.

Daniel of Tirnovo promises to pay 390 *aslania* owed to Domna Roxandra. This money represents 100 *aslania* borrowed by Daniel for diocesan needs and for his ordination gift.<sup>1</sup> The other 290 *aslania*, owed by his predecessor Ezekiel, Daniel assumes, "according to prevailing custom," as his personal debt<sup>2</sup>

Signed and sealed by: † Daniel, humble Metropolitan of Tirnovo.<sup>8</sup>

Witnessed by: † Bartholomew of Heraclea † Jeremias of Chalcedon † Neophytos of Adrianople † Makarios of Smyrna<sup>4</sup> † Kyrillos of Serres<sup>5</sup> † Makarios of Methymna<sup>6</sup> † Photios of . . . . . † Theodosios of Lititza † Makarios of Derkos<sup>7</sup> and † Kallinikos of Prousa [Bursa].<sup>8</sup>

This is the third type of seal from Tirnovo. It is 2.4 cm. in diameter, with the face divided into three horizontal sections bearing a Turkish inscription.<sup>9</sup> The circular border contains the following Greek inscription: Ο ΤΑΠΕΙΝΟΣ / ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ ΤΟΡΝΟΒΟΥ ΔΑΝΙΗΛ 1677.

---

1. It was customary for the Patriarch to receive a gift from a newly ordained bishop or metropolitan. This represented one of the several sources of income for the Patriarchate; see Vapheides, *Historia*, sec. 213, p. 93, for this and other sources of income, and Gennadios, *Synteresis*, pp. 322-27.

2. Loans made by bishops for diocesan purposes were considered diocesan debts. Consequently, a new bishop had to assume the entire debt of his diocese and was held responsible for it as long as he remained in office. This is especially made clear in No. LVI below and Nos. XXIV, XXXV, and XXXVI with regard to the Patriarchate.

3. Daniel's accession can be placed between 22 March and 1 August 1677. See No. XIV, note 3, above. He appears again in No. XVIII.

4. Present day Turkish Izmir. The earliest mention of the Church of Smyrna is found in the Book of Revelations 1:11 and 2:8-11. But its hierarchical rank was adversely affected by its diminishing flock. Consequently, in the Ottoman period Smyrna's rank ranged between twenty-seventh and forty-fifth; Papa-

dopoullos, *Studies*, p. 112.

Metropolitan Makarios is first cited in 1657 (Germanos, *Katalogoi*, p. 171). He is attested again in 1662 (*ibid.*, p. 193), in 1668 (*ibid.*, p. 200), in 1671 (*ibid.*, p. 242), in 1679 (Lampros, *Dyo Sigillia*, p. 111), and in 1681 (Eustratiades, *Mnemeia*, p. 55).

5. Serres (in Greek Macedonia) was a diocese subject to the Metropolis of Thessalonike in the eighth century. As a metropolis, its rank varied between twenty-fifth and twenty-eighth; Papadopoulos, *Studies*, p. 112.

Kyrillos can be attested as early as 1666; see Delikanes, *Engrapha*, II, 377; III, 342; Gedeon, *Chronika*, p. 114; Karmires, *Mnemeia*, II, 693. Miklosich-Müller (VI, 303, 304) cites Chrysanthos in 1673. This is a misreading.

6. Methymna, one of the two metropolises of the island of Mitylene (Lesvos), became a diocese in the fourth century (*Atlas*, p. 195), and an archdiocese in the middle of the fifth century and a metropolis during the reign of Alexios Komnenos (Athenagoras, *Lesvos*, pp. 36-41). As a metropolis, Methymna's rank varied between thirty-sixth and forty-first; Papadopoulos, *Studies*, p. 113.

Makarios appears again in Nos. XXVIII, XXXIII, XXXV, XXXVI, and XLIII. His earliest reference is 1662; his last, 1 May 1689; Germanos, *Katalogoi*, p. 193.

7. Bishop Makarios of Agathoupolis succeeded Chrysanthos as metropolitan of Derkos on 11 September 1673; Gennadios, *Photieios*, I, 213, note 45; Siderides, *Derkos*, p. 326; and Sathas, III, 599. Makarios remained in office until 1688, when he was succeeded by Nicodemos; Germanos, *Thrake*, I, 66; cf. *Θ.Η.Ε.*, IV, 1016. For Makarios' election certificate, see Aristarches, *Derkoi*, p. 420. He also appears in Nos. XXV, XXVIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXIX, and XL of the MS.

8. Present day Bursa, Turkey. At the end of the eighth century, Bursa was a diocese subject to the Metropolis of Nicomedia; Konidares, *Metropoleis*, p. 93. As a metropolis, it ranked thirteenth or fourteenth; Papadopoulos, *Studies*, p. 108.

Kallinikos, who appears again in Nos. XXVIII, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, and XXXVIII of our MS, is attested as early as June 1672; Delikanes, *Engrapha*, III, 342; Gennadios, *Photieios*, I, 178, note 9; and Gedeon, *Chronika*, p. 114. Therefore, his dates as Metropolitan of Bursa are: June 1672 to 3 March 1688. On the latter date, Kallinikos was elected

Ecumenical Patriarch as Kallinikos II; Zerlentes, *Ephemerides*, pp. 313-14; Germanos, *Katalogoi*, pp. 315-16. Kallinikos remained Patriarch until 27 November 1688, the date of his expulsion. He was re-elected for a second and third time (7 March 1689 to July/August 1693; April 1694 to 8 August 1702); cf. Grumel, *Chronologie*, p. 439.

9. Turkish inscription on episcopal seals bear Turkish forms of both the metropolitan and his metropolis. For such examples, see Gennadios, *Photieios*, I, 114.

#### NO. XVIII. AN AGREEMENT OF DANIEL OF TIRNOVO

ὁμολογία καὶ ἀπόδειξις.

Official copy.

1 August 1677.

Daniel of Tirnovo agrees to pay the Grand Logothetes,<sup>1</sup> Archon Koupares,<sup>2</sup> and Kyritzēs Michalakes [Michael] Sevastos ten per cent interest on notes encumbering his Metropolis and held by them. This represents a part of the diocesan debt Daniel assumed upon his succession. The low interest rate is a concession made by Daniel's creditors who desire to assist him in his financial difficulties.

Signed and sealed by: † Daniel humble Metropolitan of Tirnovo.

Seal is identical with that in No. XVII.

- 
1. The Grand Logothetes is John Karyophylles.
  2. Appears again in No. XXIV.

#### NO. XIX. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF FORMER PATRIARCH PARTHENIOS

ὁμολογία.

24 November 1677, Indiction 15.  
Official copy.

Former Patriarch Parthenios (still *Proedros* of *Adrianople*) borrows 400 *grosia* from the Grand Skevophylax.<sup>1</sup> The money is needed for the Patriarch's translation to Adrianople.

Terms: five months, no interest.

Signed by: † Former Patriarch of Constantinople and *Proedros* of Adrianople, debtor.

There is no *monokondylon* in the document, but simply: † παρθένι(ος) π(ατ)ριάρχ(ης).

The text, probably written by Parthenios himself, is almost

indecipherable; its spelling leaves much to be desired.

The seal is 2.4 cm. in diameter; the center is divided into four horizontal sections, two of which continue the Greek inscription begun on the circular border, while the other two contain an equivalent Turkish inscription. The Greek inscription reads: [ΠΑΡΘΕΝΙΟΣ] ΑΡΧΙΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥΠΟΛΕΩΣ ΝΕΑΣ ΡΩΜΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΟΙΚΟΤΜΕΝΙΚΟΣ ΠΑΤΡΙΑΡΧΗΣ.

---

1. The Grand Skevophylax is Alexander Mavrokordatos, appointed to this office on 5 December 1676 by Parthenios himself. See No. VII, note 2 above.

#### NO. XX. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF GRAND LOGOTHETES JOHN

οἰκεύχειρον γράμμα.      Official copy.      1 November 1678.

Domna Roxandra had loaned 1,000 *grosia* to facilitate the translation of Patriarch Prochoros of Alexandria.<sup>1</sup> The Patriarch gave his personal note to Grand Logothetes John, who acts as an intermediary in this affair, while the latter gives his own note (the present one) for 1,200 *grosia* to Alexander the Grand Dragoman. Alexander in turn gives his own note for the same amount to his mother, Domna Roxandra.<sup>2</sup>

Signed and sealed by: † Grand Logothetes of the Great Church John.

A notation at the bottom of the page indicates that John paid a total of 1,250 *grosia*.

Seal is identical with that in No. XIII.

---

1. This is Patriarch Parthenios I of Alexandria, born in Arkadia in the Peloponnesos. Parthenios changed his name twice; once to Prochoros (from Polychronios) upon his ordination as Metropolitan of Nazareth in Palestine, and a second time to Parthenios upon his election (24 October 1678) as Patriarch of Alexandria. He died in Smyrna on 30 June 1688; C. Papadopoulos, *Alexandria*, pp. 718, 722; Zerlentes, *Ephemerides*, p. 298.

2. For another example of a mother lending money to her son, see Kostas, *Apospasmata*, pp. 172-173.

## No. XXI. A SALES CONTRACT

ὁμολογία.

Official copy.

11 December 1678.

Grand Logothetes John and Grand Dragoman Alexander<sup>1</sup> purchase a diamond-studded belt from Hasan Aga, the *Kâ' im-makâm* Pasha,<sup>2</sup> for 8,500 *grosia*.

Terms: two equal payments within ninety days.

Signed by: † Grand Logothetes John † Grand Dragoman Alexander.

Witnessed by: six Turkish witnesses.<sup>3</sup>

John's seal is the same as in No. XIII.

Alexander's seal is oblong, 1.9 by 1.6 cm., with a Turkish inscription in the center.

No. XXI, *verso* indicates that the purchase price was paid in full, but at least ten months later.

---

1. Alexander Mavrokordatos signs as Grand Dragoman in Nos. XX, XXVI, and XXVII. For this office, see No. VII, note 2 above.

2. This may be the same Hasan Aga who loaned money to Patriarch Joachim of Alexandria; see No. VI. Here Hasan is cited as the *Kâ'immakâm* Pasha. As such he replaced the Grand Vizier whenever the latter was absent from the city. For details concerning this office, see Hamilton Gibb and Harold Bowen, *Islamic Society and the West: A Study of the Impact of Western Civilization on Moslem Culture in the Near East*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1950), I, 114.

3. All the witnesses sign in Turkish.

## No. XXII. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF RHETOR DEMETRIOS

ὁμολογία.

Official copy.

1 January 1679<sup>1</sup>

Demetrios promises to repay an outstanding debt of 500 *as-lania* to Grand Logothetes John.

Terms: one year with no interest, but twenty per cent thereafter.

Signed and sealed by: † Rhetor Demetrios.<sup>2</sup>

Witnessed by: † Neophytos of Adrianople † Alexander<sup>3</sup> † Ananias of Maronia<sup>4</sup> † Theodosios of Lititza.

Text is personally written by Rhetor Demetrios.

Demetrios' seal is oblong, 1.4 by 1.9 cm., with a Turkish inscription in the center, and a Greek border inscription reading: ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΔΟΥΛΟΣ.

---

1. This is the only document in the MS dated "in the 1679th Year of Christ."

2. Also cited as Rhetor in Nos. XXIX and XXX.

3. The signature suggests this is Alexander Mavrokordatos.

4. Maronia (in Greek Thrace) became an archdiocese in the middle of the fifth century (Konidares, *Metropoleis*, p. 71) and a metropolis shortly after 1365. Suffering the consequences of war, Maronia was demoted to the rank of exarchate at the end of the fifteenth century. It was re-established with the rank of metropolis in 1646 by Patriarch Ioannikios II; Germanos, *Thrake*, I, 85. Subsequently, its rank varied between forty-seventh and fifty-first; Papadopoulos, *Studies*, p. 114.

Metropolitan Ananias (succeeded Pankratios, 1648-1667) is also attested in Nos. XXIII and XXVIII. The earliest reference to him is May 1667 (Gedeon, *Diataxeis*, I, 58); the last, 1683; Germanos, *Thrake*, I, p. 87, note 1.

#### NO. XXIII. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF CHRYSANTHOS OF TZEVERNO

ὁμολογία καὶ ἀπόδειξις.

Official copy.

1 May 1679

Chrysanthos of Tzeverno (Cernovo) reaches an agreement with Grand Logothetes Ioannakes [John] with respect to the Patriarchal *zeteia* [offering]<sup>1</sup> amounting to 42,000 *grosia*. Chrysanthos promises to pay the latter within thirteen months.

Signed and sealed by: † Chrysanthos, humble bishop of Tzeverno.<sup>2</sup>

Witnessed by: † Makarios of Drystra † Ananias of Maronia.

Chrysanthos' seal is 1.9 cm. in diameter, with an unidentifiable figure in the center. The circular inscription reads: Ο ΤΑΠΕΙΝΟΣ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ Τ[ΖΕΒΕΡΝΟΥ] ΧΡΤ[CAN]-Θ[OC] . . . .

---

1. Instituted sometime between 1514-1556, the *zeteia* was a voluntary offering made to the Patriarchate by clergy and laymen. It was abolished in 1641 when Voevode John Basil of Moldavia paid the entire debt of the Patriarchate. See texts in Gedeon,



*Diataxeis*, I, 392 and Delikanēs, *Engrapha*, III, 288-92, 296-302, and 303-09.

Later, the Patriarchate found itself in debt again and the *zeteia* was reinstituted, but on a compulsory rather than a voluntary basis. It was not abolished until 1741.

In the MS the *zeteia* is mentioned again in Nos. XXXV and XXXIX.

2. Cernovo (in present day Bulgaria) was a diocese subject to the Metropolitan of Timovo; see Papadopoulos, *Studies*, p. 107.

Bishop Chrysanthos appears nowhere else in the MS, and I have been unable to find any additional references to him. Possibly succeeded Joseph who served Cernovo between July 1668 and January 1671; Germanos, *Thrake*, II, 174. Gedeon (*Ephemerides*, pp. 107-108) records another *zeteia* obligation of 30,000 *aspra* due to the Patriarchate by Gabriel of Cernovo on 6 February 1652.

#### NO. XXIV. AN AGREEMENT

συμφωνία.

Official copy.

20 July 1680.

Constantine Koupare, Grand Logothetes John, Drakos Eupragiotes, and Laskarakes Rossetos agree to share all legal and other necessary expenses to secure 30,000 *grosia* owed to them by the boyars of Voevode John Doukas.

Signed by: † Constantine Koupare † Grand Logothetes John<sup>1</sup>  
† Laskarakes Rossetos<sup>2</sup> † Drakos Eupragiotes.<sup>3</sup>

1. This is John Karyophylles.

2. Laskarakes Rossetos appears again in Nos. XXVIII *verso*, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, L and LI. In Nos. XXXIV, XXXV, and XXXVI, he is cited as the former Grand Spatharios; in Nos. L and LI, he is referred to as dead.

3. See No. XVI, note 1 above.

#### NO. XXV. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF ATHANASIOS OF CHRISTIANOUPOLIS

ἐνυπόγραφος καὶ ἐμμάρτυρος ὁμολογία.

15 March 1681.

Official copy.

Athanasios of Christianoupolis borrows 420 *aslania* from Diakaiophylax Rhales.<sup>1</sup> The money is given to the Patriarchate by Athanasios as his ordination gift.

Terms: one year, twenty per cent interest thereafter, and to be paid in Constantinople.

Confirmed and signed by: † the Patriarch.<sup>2</sup>

Signed and sealed by: † Athanasios, humble Metropolitan of Christianoupolis.<sup>3</sup>

Witnessed by: † Meletios of Nicomedia<sup>4</sup> † Jeremias of Chalcedon † Gregory of Didymoteichon<sup>5</sup> † Makarios of Derkos, † Theodosios of Lititza † Grand Chartophylax Balasios † Grand Rhetor Photios<sup>6</sup> † Grand Ekklesiarches Manolakes (Manouel) † Rhetor Andronakes and † John Mavrogordatos.

The accuracy of the copy is confirmed by: † Protapostolarios Paraskevas<sup>7</sup> † Logothetes Chourmouzes<sup>8</sup> † Spantones.<sup>9</sup>

---

1. Rhales Karyophylles was the son of John Karyophylles. In No. XXV *verso*, he is mentioned by name only; in Nos. XXXIX, XLIV, and LVII, as Grand Ekklesiarches; in Nos. LIV and LVI, as Grand Rhetor; and in No. LVIII, as Grand Chartophylax. Hence Rhales' *cursus honorum* is as follows: Grand Ekklesiarches, 1 May 1687 to 25 March 1691; Grand Rhetor, 24 March 1698 to 27 February 1701; Grand Chartophylax, 10 February 1705 to shortly before his death on 2 March 1707; see Zerlentes, *Ephemerides*, pp. 287 and 300.

2. Patriarch Iakovos I, former Metropolitan of Larissa, was elected Ecumenical Patriarch on 10 August 1679 and enthroned on 14 or 15 August of the same year; Gedeon, *Pinakes*, pp. 603-04. After his expulsion, he was subsequently appointed *Proedros* of Chios, his birthplace.

On 20 March 1685, Iakovos returned for the second time and remained patriarch until the end of March 1686; Grumel, *Chronologie*, p. 439. On 12 October 1687 Iakovos became Patriarch for the third and last time. He resigned on 3 March 1688 and traveled to Moldavia where he died in March 1690; Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 606. Patriarch Iakovos also appears in Nos. XXVI, XXVII, XXXIV, XXXV, and XXXVI.

3. Christianoupolis (in the Peloponnesos) became a diocese about the tenth century. Later, it is not known when, it was elevated to an independent archdiocese and a metropolis; *Dictionnaire*, XII, 773-74.

Athanasios does not appear elsewhere in the MS, but is cited from 1680 to 1710; Gritsopoulos, *Demetsana*, pp. 121-35 and

Doukakes, *Katalogos*, p. 367.

4. Meletios of Nicomedia appears eight times in the MS: Nos. XXV, XXVIII, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXIX, XL, and is attested as late as January 1691; Delikanes, *Engrapha*, I, 442, 448; Zakythenos, *Engrapha*, II, 394. Previous to his translation to Nicomedia, Meletios was Metropolitan of Thessalonike (1672-1680); Zerlentes, *Ephemerides*, p. 300; Lampros, *Enthymeseis*, p. 199.

5. Gregory, who succeeded Iakovos (see No. IX, note 9 above), is attested as early as 1672 (Gennadios, *Photieios*, I, 178, note 9; *Dictionnaire*, XIV, 429) and as late as October 1686; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Bibliothèque*, I, pp. 309, 336. Gregory of Didymoteichon appears in No. XXXIX and again in Nos. XXVIII verso, XXXIX, and XL (1 May 1687). Signatures cannot be compared to determine whether or not it is the same Gregory because our text is a copy. Gregory died on 21 January 1693 on the island of Patmos; he had served as *hegoumenos* (abbot) of the island's monastery for a number of years prior to his death; Gennadios, *Photieios*, II, 3, note 2; Miklosich-Müller, VI, 311.

6. Photios appears nowhere else in the MS, but is known to have held this office in 1675; see Hypselantes, *Halosis*, pp. 280-81. He is the father of the Grand Dierneneutes Diamantes who appears in No. LXIII.

7. Paraskevas is also a witness in Nos. XXVI, XXVII, XLI, XLIV, and XLV. His dates are: 15 March 1681 to January 1691. For the latter date, see Delikanes, *Engrapha*, II, 443.

8. Chourmouzes is attested in three offices in our MS: Logothetes, in Nos. XLI, XLIV, XLV, in addition to the present document; Dikaiophylax, in Nos. LIII and LIX; and Protovestiaris, in Nos. XXVI, XXVII, and XXVIII.

9. Appears again in No. XLII.

#### No. XXV. Verso.

On 7 May 1690 Athanasios of Christianoupolis sent Rhales Karyophylles 383½ *grosia* through Oikonomos Nicholas, the priest. A discount of 36½ *grosia* had been previously agreed to by Rhales, who returned to the Metropolitan the latter's *pateritza* (pastoral staff), gold-lettered *leitourgike* (service book), "written" *leitourgike*, and a stole. These items were held as collateral.

## No. XXVI. A FINAL SETTLEMENT

ἐνυπόγραφον γράμμα.

Official copy.

5 April 1682.

Grand Dragoman Alexander and Grand Logothetes John declare and confirm that all outstanding financial and business matters between them are now settled, and any promissory notes or letters of credit appearing subsequent to this agreement are invalid.

Confirmed and signed by: † Patriarch Iakovos<sup>1</sup> † Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem.<sup>2</sup>

Signed and sealed by: † Grand Dragoman Alexander † Grand Logothetes John.

Witnessed by: † Grand Chartophylax Balases † Protovestiarios Chourmouzes<sup>3</sup> † Protapostolarios Paraskevas † Ostiarios Petros<sup>4</sup> † George son of Demetrios<sup>5</sup> † Drakos Eupragiotes † John Ramadanes.

Signatures of both Patriarchs appear at the top of the text.

John's seal is similar that in No. XIII.

Alexander's seal is similar to that in No. XXI.

1. See No. XXV, note 2.

2. Patriarch Dositheos, who appears again in Nos. XXVII and XLVI, was one of the most important ecclesiastical figures of the Orthodox Church in the seventeenth century.

Born in Arachovo (near Corinth), Greece, in 1641, he was ordained deacon by his godfather, Gregory Galanos, Metropolitan of Corinth. In 1657, Dositheos went to Constantinople where he became the Archdeacon of Patriarch Nektarios of Jerusalem (1661-69). In 1666, he was elected Metropolitan of Caesarea in Palestine. Three years later, at the age of twenty-eight, he succeeded Patriarch Nektarios of Jerusalem, who had resigned.

Dositheos remained Patriarch of Jerusalem until 1707, but spent only two years in Jerusalem. Despite this fact, he faithfully served the Church of Jerusalem, founding schools, libraries, and churches.

In 1672 Dositheos presided over a Synod convoked in Jerusalem whose formulations were aimed at resisting both Roman Catholic and Protestant propaganda among the Orthodox. For Dositheos' doctrinal works and bibliography, see *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique*, IV (1911), 1788-1780; Karmires, *Mne-meia*, II, 734-73; Karmires, *Ὁρθοδοξία καὶ Προτεσταντισμός*

(Athens, 1937), pp. 250-59; and *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, Vol. III (1959), p. 527.

3. See No. XXV, note 8.

4. Ostiarios Petros signs again as a witness in Nos. XXVII, XXVIII, and XXXII. His earliest and latest mention in the MS: 5 April 1682 to 23 April 1684.

5. Appears again in No. XXVII.

#### NO. XXVII. A DECLARATION OF GRAND DRAGOMAN ALEXANDER<sup>1</sup>

ἐνυπόγραφον γράμμα.

Official copy.

5 April 1682.

Alexander declares that a certain house in Adrianople, whose deed was in his name, is not in fact his, but belongs to Grand Logothetes John.

Confirmed and signed by: † Patriarch Iakovos † Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem.

Signed and sealed by: † Grand Dragoman Alexander.

Witnessed by: † Grand Chartophylax Balases † Protovestiaris Chourmouzes † Protapostolarios Paraskevas † Ostiarios Petros † George, son of Demetrios † Drakos Eupragiotes † John Ramadanes.

Signatures of the two Patriarchs appear at the top of the text. Alexander's seal is similar to that in No. XXI.

---

1. This document is related to No. XXVI above.

#### NO. XXVIII. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF NEKTARIOS OF PHILIPPOPOLIS

ἐνυπόγραφος καὶ ἐμμάτυρος ὁμολογία. Copy. 15 October 1682.

Metropolitan Nektarios borrows 600 *aslania* from Domna Roxandra. The money is to be used in connection with his translation to Philippopolis.

Terms: one year, and twenty per cent thereafter on the unpaid balance.

Signed by: † Nektarios of Philippopolis.<sup>1</sup>

Signed and guaranteed by: † Nicholas son of Constantine † Protovestiaris Chourmouzes † Protekdikos Athanasios † De-

metrios son of Triphoglous † Repherentarios Manolakes.

Witnessed by: † Bartholomew of Heraclea † Kyrillos of Kyzikos<sup>2</sup> † Meletios of Nikomedia † Jeremia of Chalcedon † Kallinikos of Prousa † Makarios of Laressa † Klemes of Jannina<sup>3</sup> † Makarios of Methymna † Ananias of Maronia † Theokletos of Sophia<sup>4</sup> † Makarios of Derkos † Grand Chartophylax Balases † Ostiarios Petros.

Nektarios' seal is 2.1 cm. in diameter, has a Turkish inscription in the center, and the following Greek border inscription: Ο ΤΑΠΕΙΝΟΣ ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΤΡΟΛΕΩΣ ΝΕΚΤΑΡΙΟΣ . . .

---

1. The date of Metropolitan Nektarios' election to the see of Philippopolis (he had formerly been Metropolitan of Selymvia) is not known. Our document shows that he was in office on 15 October 1682. His signature appears again in Nos. XXXVII and XXXVIII. On 7 January 1689, Nektarios was translated to the Metropolis of Didymoteichon; see Delikanes, *Engrapha*, II, 423-30. Like Neophytos of Didymoteichon, later also of Philippopolis (see No. XXV, note 5 above), Nektarios was a member of the monastic community of St. John of Patmos; Gennadios, *Photieios*, II, 3, note 2.

2. Metropolitan Kyrillos also appears in Nos. XXVIII *verso*, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX, XL, XLII, XLVIII, XLIX, L, LI, LIV, and LVI. His earliest and last mention in the MS: 1 September 1684 (No. XXXIII)—27 February 1701 (No. LVI). Kyrillos, however, served Kyzikos until 4 December 1711, at which time he succeeded Patriarch Athanasios V (1709-11). He remained Patriarch until the end of October 1713; Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 619. In the MS Kyrillos IV appears as Patriarch in No. LXI.

3. Klemes (Clement) succeeded Iakovos as Metropolitan of Jannina in 1680 and continued until 1716; Athenagoras, *Jannina*, p. 33. Klemes is also attested in 1689 and 1697; Delikanes, *Engrapha*, II, 430, 452.

4. Sofia (in present day Bulgaria) is the old Roman city of Sardica. First attested in 325, the Church of Sofia was probably founded sometime in the previous century; *Atlas*, p. 200.

Theokletos does not appear elsewhere in the MS and is not included among the published lists of hierarchs of the metropolis of Sofia.

With the death of Domna Roxandra,<sup>1</sup> this note, worth 650 *aslania* at the end of April 1685, is inherited by her daughter Zoe as part of her share of the estate.

Confirmed by the other heirs: † John Mavrogordatos, † Kokona<sup>2</sup> and † Mariora.

Witnessed by: † Laskarakes Rosetos † Drakos Eupragiotes † Grand Diermeneutes Spantones † Drakos Chrysoskoulos and † Chrysoskoulos.

The accuracy of this copy is confirmed by: † Bartholomew of Heraclea † Kyrillos of Kyzikos † Neophytos of Adrianople † Meletios of Nicomedia † Sophronios of Nicaea<sup>3</sup> † Neophytos of Athens † Gregory of Didymoteichon † Kallinikos of Prousa † Gregory of Mitylene<sup>4</sup> † Ignatios of Smyrna † Gregory of Chios.

1. On 29 October 1684; see No. III, note 2 above.

2. Kokona appears again in Nos. L and LIII.

3. Sophronios was elected Metropolitan of Nicaea on 1 February 1676 during the fourth patriarchate of Parthenios IV; Genadios, *Photieios*, I, 213, note 46. He is last referred to in May 1687; Delikanes, *Engrapha*, II, 410, 505.

4. The Greek Island of Mytilene (Lesvos) possessed two metropolises, the sees of Mytilene on the southeastern shore, and Methymna on the northeastern shore.

In the Ottoman period the former outranked the latter. Papadopoulos, *Studies*, p. 112.

Metropolitan Gregory also signs as a witness in Nos. XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, and XL. His earliest reference is 1 September 1684 (No. XXXIII), his last, in 1691; Delikanes, *Engrapha*, II, 442, 448; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Bibliothèque*, I, 353.

## No. XXIX. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF PANKRATIOS OF KAMENITZA

ἐνυπόγραφον καὶ ἐμμάστιγον γράμμα.

28 December 1682.

Official copy.

Pankratios of Kamenitza signs a note for 1,225 *aslania* representing the price of various items of jewelry purchased from Grand Ekklesiarches Manolakes. The jewelry is to be exchanged

in Kamenitza to satisfy the Metropolitan's many creditors.

Terms: one year, and twenty per cent interest thereafter on the unpaid balance.

Signed and sealed by: † Pankratios, humble Metropolitan of Kamenitza.<sup>1</sup>

Guaranteed by: † Angeles son of George.<sup>2</sup>

Witnessed by: Limberes son of Sevastos the priest † Rhales son of the former Grand Primikerios † Thanases son of Letares † Rhetor Demetrios and † Constantes the Priest, guarantor.

Pankratios' seal differs from the other episcopal seals in our MS. It is circular, 2.2 cm. in diameter, with a head of an unidentifiable animal in the center, surrounded by the letters: Π Τ Μ Κ.

---

1. Kamenića (perhaps, in present day Yugoslav Macedonia) and its metropolitan are not cited in any of the episcopal lists I have examined.

Metropolitan Pankratios, however, also appears in Nos. XXX and XXXI.

2. Appears again as guarantor for his brother in No. XXX.

#### NO. XXX. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF PANKRATIOS OF KAMENITZA

ἐνυπόγραφον καὶ ἐμμάτυρον γράμμα.

28 December 1682.

Official copy.

On the same day (as No. XXIX) Pankratios purchased additional jewelry on credit from Grand Rhetor Andronakes for 260 *aslania*.

Terms: one year, and twenty per cent interest thereafter on the unpaid balance.

Signed and sealed by: † Pankratios, humble Metropolitan of Kamenitza.

Guaranteed by: † Angeles son of George.

Witnessed by: † Thanases son of Letares † Constantes the Priest, guarantor † John the Priest, guarantor † Rhetor Demetrios † Rhales son of the former Grand Primikerios.

The seal is identical with that in No. XXIX.



NO. XXXI. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF CHRISTIANS  
FROM KAMENITZA

δμολογία.

Official copy.

7 January 1683.

Pankratios of Kamenitza, John the Priest, John (Geovanes) the Tailor (Terzes), and Demetrios the Tailor (Terzes) borrow 82 *grosia* from Archon Manolakes.<sup>1</sup>

Terms: two months.

Signed by: † Pankratios, humble Metropolitan of Kamenitza and Petras<sup>2</sup> † John the Priest, Locum tenens of Kamenitza † Ivan K̄ravetz (the Tailor) † Demetrios Kravetz (the Tailor).

Both the text and the Metropolitan's signature are written by the same hand. This is also true of Nos. XXIX and XXX. Because the scripts differ so much, it is very probable that either XXIX and XXX or XXXI was written by someone other than the Metropolitan.

Pankratios changed his seal in 1683. It is circular, 4.5 cm. in diameter, with a full figure of a lion in the center. Its circular inscription reads as follows: † ΠΑΗΚΡΑ[ΤΙΟC] ΧΙΛΑ . . .

---

1. Probably Manolakes Karyophylles.

2. In Nos. XXIX and XXX Pankratios is simply Metropolitan of Kamenitza. Here the additional title of Petras (?) is added.

NO. XXXII. POWER OF ATTORNEY

ἐπιτροπικὸν γράμμα.

Official copy.

23 April 1684.

Velisarios the merchant empowers Grand Ekklesiarches Manolakes to collect a debt of 995 *aslania* owed to the former by Hatze Romanos the merchant.<sup>1</sup> The debt represents a cash loan plus merchandise sold in Kazakhstan.

Signed by: † Velisarios.

Witnessed by: † Ostiarios Petros † Logothetes tou Genikou John<sup>2</sup> † Logothetes Chourmouzes<sup>3</sup> † George the Priest † Demetres son of Kanelos † Panagiotes son of Stavrenos.

---

1. From the Arabic *Haci*. A title assumed by Christians who had made a pilgrimage to the Holy Places, and Muslims who had gone to Mecca and Medina.

2. The office of Logothetes tou Genikou held the tenth rank

among the lay officials of the Patriarchate; Gedeon, *Chronika*, p. 195. In addition to his secretarial duties, the Logothetes *tou Genikou* also acted as treasurer; Rhalles, *Logothetes*, p. 157.

3. Codinus (*De officiis*, p. 4) places the office of Logothetes in the second rank of the second *pentas*. His duties were: 1) to assist the Protekdikos as judge in judicial matters, 2) to keep the Patriarchal seal and to affix it on all Patriarchal documents, 3) to preach catechetical sermons, 4) to write discourses on Great Feasts of the Church, 5) to confirm the date of indiction, and 6) to hold the tray with the *antidoron* (the remains of the loaves used in the celebration of the Eucharist which are distributed to the worshippers at the end of the service); Rhalles, *Logothetes*, p. 155. Frequently, the Logothetes also held other *officia* simultaneously, such as Nomikos, Tavoularios, and Dikaiofylax; *Ibid.*, p. 156.

In the Ottoman period the dignity fell both in rank and in importance, and was not included among the important offices of the Church. The Logothetes' place was taken by the Grand Logothetes; see No. XV, note 1 above.

#### NO. XXXIII. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF NEKTARIOS OF PHILIPPOPOLIS

ἐνυπόγραφον καὶ ἐμμάρτυρον γράμμα.

1 September 1684.

Official copy.

Due to diocesan needs, Nektarios of Philippopolis borrows 1,250 *aslania* from Grand Ekklesiarches Manolakes.

Terms: 250 *aslania* in six months, another 1,000 in one year; and twenty-five per cent interest on any unpaid balance at the close of the year.

Signed and sealed by: † Nektarios, humble Metropolitan of Philippopolis.

Witnessed by: † Kyrillos of Kyzikos † Meletios of Nicomedia † Jeremias of Chalcedon † Kallinikos of Prousa † Makarios of Methymna † Iakovos of Athens<sup>1</sup> † Gregory of Mitylene.

Seal is identified with that in No. XXVIII.

---

1. Iakovos I also appears in Nos. XXXIV, XXXV and XXXVI. He was elected Metropolitan of Athens in July 1676 and remained in office until October 1686 when he was succeeded

by Athanasios II; Delikanes, *Engrapha*, II, 399; *Photieios*, I, 213, note 46. He died in Nauplion in 1691. See No. XXV, note 3 above.

NO. XXXIV. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF  
PATRIARCH PARTHENIOS

πατριαρχική ὁμολογία.

Official copy.

1 May 1685.

Patriarch Parthenios promises to pay Laskarakes Rosetos, former Grand Spatharios, 2,710 *aslania* borrowed by his predecessor Patriarch Dionysios.<sup>1</sup> The money will be derived from the Patriarchal *zeteia* collected by the Metropolitans of Smyrna, Neocaesaria,<sup>2</sup> Serres, Tirnovo, and the latter's bishops.<sup>3</sup>

Terms: one year, and twenty per cent thereafter on the unpaid balance.

Signed and sealed by: † Patriarch Parthenios of Constantinople.

Guaranteed by: † Bartholomew of Heraclea † Kyrillos of Kyzikos † Jeremias of Chalcedon † Meletios of Nicomedia † Ioasaph of Amasia<sup>4</sup> † Kallinikos of Prousa † Iakovos of Athens † Gregorios of Mitylne † Anthimos of Serres † Kyprianos of Neocaesaria † Makarios of Derkos.

---

1. Dionysios IV was born in Constantinople and was educated in the Patriarchal Academy. On 9 August 1662, while still a layman, he was elected Metropolitan of Larissa; Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 595. Together with Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem, he led the struggle against the spread of Calvinism among the faithful of the Patriarchate. It was for this purpose that he convened the Council of Constantinople in 1672; see Karmires, *Mnemeia*, II, 687-94 for the proceedings.

In 1673 Dionysios was expelled and replaced by Gerasimos of Tirnovo through the intervention of Grand Dragoman Panagiotis Nikouses. Dionysios' second patriarchate began on 29 July 1676 and lasted officially until 2 August 1680, although he was expelled on the 29th of the previous month; Grumel, *Chronologie*, p. 439. Dionysios was then appointed *Proedros* of Philipopolis.

He was returned to the Patriarchal dignity for the third time on 30 July 1682 and retained it until 10 March 1684. He was ex-

pelled again and appointed *Proedros* of Chalcedon; Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 604.

Dionysios' fourth patriarchate lasted from April 1686 to 12 October 1687; Grumel, *Chronologie*, p. 439. Subsequently, he travelled to Wallachia, where he remained until he was elected Patriarch for the fifth time in April 1693.

Expelled for the fifth and last time in April 1694, Dionysios went to Bucharest. He died there on 23 September 1696; Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 610.

2. Nîksar in present day Turkey. The Church of Neocaesaria dates from the second century, and its bishop participated in the Council of Nicaea in 325; *Atlas*, p. 197. In the Ottoman period Neocaesaria's rank varied between fourteenth and twenty-sixth among the metropoleis.

3. These would be the bishops of Tzerveno (Černovo), Lophtza (Loveč), and Preslava (Preslav); Papadopoulos, *Studies*, pp. 107-08.

4. Ioasaph appears again in Nos. XXXV, XXXVI, and XLVIII. He is attested from 1684 (Delikanes, *Engrapha*, I, 393) to 20 May 1693 (No. XLVIII). *Θ.Χ.Ε.* (I, 861) lists him only until 1691.

#### NO. XXXV. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF PATRIARCH IAKOVOS

πατριαρχική ὁμολογία.

Official copy.

1 March 1685.

With the assistance of the Metropolitans of Smyrne, Rhodes,<sup>1</sup> Anchialos,<sup>2</sup> Sozopolis,<sup>3</sup> and the bishop of Agathoupolis,<sup>4</sup> Patriarch Iakovos promises to pay Spatharios Laskarakes Rosetos 1,500 *aslania* which had been borrowed by the Great Church of Christ [=the Patriarchate] to purchase some jewelry given as a gift.<sup>5</sup>

Signed and sealed by: † the Patriarch of Constantinople.

Guaranteed by: † Bartholomew of Heraclea † Meletios of Nicomedia † Sophronios of Nicaea † Ioasaph of Amasia † Kallinikos of Prousa † Iakovos of Athens † Gregory of Mitylene † Makarios of Methymna † Gregory of Chios † Makarios of Derkos † Kyprianos of Neocaesaria.

The text is headed by the *monokondylion* of Patriarch Iakovos.

Iakovos' seal is 2.1 cm. in diameter, with a Turkish inscription in the center divided by the last two words of the inscription which begins on the border of the seal. The full text reads: IAKΩBOC

ΕΛΕΩ Θ(ΕΟ)Υ ΑΡΧΙΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ΚΩΝΣΤΑΝΤΙΝΟΥΠΟ-  
ΛΕΩΣ ΝΕΑΣ ΡΩΜΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΟΙΚΟΥΜΕΝΙΚΟΣ ΠΑΤΡΙΑΡΧΗΣ  
ΑΧΟΕ.

---

1. Perhaps the Metropolitan Parthenios of Rhodes, attested from 1686 to February 1692; see Delikanes, *Engrapha*, II, 399; Gedeon, *Diataxeis*, I, 105; Karmires, *Mnemeia*, II, 783; and Lampros, *Tria Sigillia*, p. 97. The same Parthenios appears again in Nos. XXXVII and XXXVIII of the MS.

2. Metropolitan Daniel. See No. XIV, note 6 above.

3. Either Sophronios cited in 1672 or his successor Gerasimos; Stamoules, *Thrake*, p. 173; Germanos, *Thrake*, II, 171.

4. Either Makarios, elected 26 September 1673, or Romanos cited on August 1699; Germanos, *Thrake*, I, 119 and Stamoules, *Thrake*, p. 67.

5. The Greek text uses the word Τζεβαχόριον (Turkish, Cevher; plural Cevhîr) to indicate the gift for which the money was borrowed. The jewelry was given εἰς τόπον indicating, I suspect, that it was a gift for some Ottoman official.

NO. XXXVI. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF PATRIARCH  
IAKOVOS

πατριαρχική ὁμολογία.

Official copy.  
Indiction 8.

15 May 1685.

Patriarch Iakovos promises to pay Laskarakes Rosetos 630 *as-lania* owed by former Patriarch Dionysios.<sup>1</sup> The money was used to purchase a gift for the *Ka' immakâm* Pasha of Constantinople.<sup>2</sup>

Signed by: † Patriarch Iakovos.

Guaranteed by: † Bartholomew of Heraclea † Meletios of Nicomedia † Sophronios of Nicaea † Ioasaph of Amasia † Kalinikos of Prousa † Iakovos of Athens † Gregory of Mitylene Makarios of Methymna † Gregory of Chios † Makarios of Derkos † Kyprianos of Neocaesaria.

Seal is identical with that in No. XXXV.

The text bears the Patriarch's *monokondylion*.

---

1. See No. XXXIV, note 3.

2. See No. XXI, note 2.

NO. XXXVII. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF NEKTARIOS  
OF PHILIPPOPOLIS

ἐνυπόγραφος καὶ ἐμμέστερος ὁμολογία.

1 January 1687.

Official copy.

Because of losses incurred in his metropolis due to various unnamed circumstances, Metropolitan Nektarios is forced to renew his promissory note of 1,000 *aslania* (originally borrowed for diocesan needs from Grand Ekklesiarches Manolakes at twenty per cent interest). Nektarios promises to divide the interest he owes on all of his outstanding debts, amounting to 300 *aslania* annually, into five parts; one fifth of this (69 *aslania*) plus 100 *aslania* (representing the new interest) is promised to Manolakes annually for five years.

Terms: ten per cent for five years twenty per cent thereafter.

Signed by: † Nektarios of Philippopolis.

Witnessed by: † Bartholomew of Heraclea † Kyrillos of Kyzikos † Gabriel of Chalcedon<sup>1</sup> † Kallinikos of Prousa † Parthenios of Rhodes<sup>2</sup> † Athanasios of Athens.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Metropolitan Gabriel succeeded Patriarch Dionysios IV who served as *Proedros* of Chalcedon from 1685 to the end of March 1686; Zerlentes, *Ephemerides*, p. 308 and Germanos, *Katalogoi*, p. 237. Gabriel's date of appointment cannot be established with accuracy. We know that Gabriel is attested as Metropolitan of Chalcedon in October 1686; Delikanes, *Engrapha*, I, 399. He also appears in Nos. XXXVII, XXXVIII, XL, XLIII, and LVI. According to *Miklosich-Müller* (VI, 309), Gabriel was succeeded by Klemes, sometime between 15 June 1687 and February 1688. But the accuracy of this reading is subject to doubt, since Gabriel is attested in office as late as 27 February 1701; see Delikanes, *Engrapha*, II, 430 and 448; Gennadios, *Photieios*, II, 114; Gedeon, *Chronika*, p. 168, and No. LVI below. Gabriel remained at Chalcedon until his election as patriarch in the middle of August 1702. For complete bibliography see Germanos, *Katalogoi*, pp. 415-18. Patriarch Gabriel (died 17 October 1707) shares with his predecessor Kallinikos II the rather rare distinction of having died in office.

2. Parthenios appears again in XXXVIII and XL. He is first mentioned in October 1686 (Delikanes, *Engrapha*, II, 399), and

last in February 1692; Lampros, *Tria Sigillia*, p. 97.

3. Metropolitan Athanasios II is attested as early as 1686; Delikanes, *Engrapha*, II, 399, and Mystakides, *Katalogoi*, p. 153. He appears again in Nos. XXXVIII and XXXIX. Athanasios remained Metropolitan of Athens until 1689; Mystakides, *Katalogoi*, p. 153; *Θ.Η.Ε.*, I, 551 and 704.

### NO. XXXVIII. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF NEKTARIOS OF PHILIPPOPOLIS

ἐνυπόγραφος καὶ ἐμμάρτυρος ὁμολογία.

1 January 1687.

Official copy.

Nektarios concludes a similar agreement (as in No. XXXVII) with Hypomnematographos Andronakes.<sup>1</sup> Specifically, he promises to make an interest payment of 30 *aslania* annually for five years.

Signed and sealed by: † Nektarios of Philippopolis.

Witnessed by: † Bartholomew of Heraclea † Kyrillos of Kyzikos † Gabriel of Chalcedon † Parthenios of Prousa † Parthenios of Rhodes † Athanasios of Athens.

Seal is identical with that in No. XXVII.

---

1. Andronakes Karyophylles also appears in No. XXXIX (1 May 1687). He was appointed Hypomnematographos on 12 September 1684; Zerlentes, *Ephemerides*, 286, note 1.

### NO. XXXIX. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF KALLINIKOS OF CRETE

ὑποσχετικὸν καὶ βεβαιωτικὸν γράμμα.

1 May 1687.

Official copy.

Various unfavorable conditions and obstacles in the metropolis of Crete made it impossible for Metropolitan Kallinikos to pay the debts of his metropolis. He, therefore, grants his creditors, the brothers Grand Rhetor Manolakes, Grand Ekklesiarches Ralakes, and Hypomnematographos Andronakes,<sup>1</sup> the right to collect the income of the diocese of Kydonia<sup>2</sup> through an agent of their choosing or through the Chartophylax of Kydonia, Constantine the Athenian (son of the priest Oikonomos Pantoleon)

until the debt is paid. The diocesan income consists of the yearly *haratsi* (*Kharadj*), the patriarchal *zeteia*, one gold *florin* from each priest, and twelve *aslania* from each layman.<sup>3</sup> Kallinikos indicates that he will replace the monies, normally collected from the *haratsi* and the *zeteia*, from the general income of the entire Metropolis of Crete and from his personal funds.

Confirmed and sealed by: † Kallinikos, humble Metropolitan of Crete.<sup>4</sup>

Witnessed by: † Kyrillos of Kyzikos † Meletios of Nicomedia † Neophytos of Adrianople † Gregory of Didymoteichon † Athanasios of Athens † Makarios of Derkos.

Promised by: † Athanasios Proedros of Crete.<sup>5</sup>

Witnessed by: † Gregory of Chaldia.<sup>6</sup>

Kallinikos' seal is circular, 2.1 cm. in diameter, and divided into three horizontal sections, the first of which bears the name Crete. The other two are too faint to be read. The inscription reads: ΚΑΛΛΙΝΙΚΟΣ ΑΡΧΙΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ 168(6?) ΚΡΗΤΗΣ.

Athanasios' seal is a hexagon, 1.9 by 1.6 cm. and consists of four horizontal sections. Of these, the first and fourth contain a Turkish inscription, while the second and third read: Ο ΚΡΗΤΗΣ [ΑΘΑ]ΝΑΣΙΟΣ.

---

1. All sons of John Karyophylles.

2. Kydonia was one of the thirteen dioceses subject to the Metropolitan of Crete; Papadopoulos, *Studies*, p. 113. Kydonia (in the western part of the island) is attested as early as 342/43, when its bishop participated in the Council of Sardica; Tomadakes, *Kydonia*, p. 4. Under Venetian rule, Roman Catholic bishops occupied the diocese from 1282 to 1664; Tomadakes, *Kydonia*, pp. 17-18. The Turkish conquest of the island brought the return of Orthodox hierarchs. The first known Orthodox bishop of Kydonia in this period is Dionysios, cited as the former Bishop of Kydonia in 1679. Another former Bishop of Kydonia, Kallinikos, is attested in 1684; Tomadakes, *Kydonia*, p. 19.

At the signing of the above promissory note, the Bishop of Kydonia was either Gennadios, mentioned in 1683, or Arsenios, cited between 1699 and 1705; Tomadakes, *Kydonia*, p. 20.

3. We learn from a letter of Patriarch Kallinikos II that each Christian household was required to pay twelve *aspers* annually to both the local metropolitan and the Patriarchate. (Text in Gen-



nadios, *Synteresis*, p. 324.) The tax paid by priests goes back to Byzantine times while the poll tax (kharadj) was taken over by the Ottomans from the Arabs.

Originally the kharadj was a land tax and the *djizya* represented the poll or head tax. But in time, the former came to represent the poll tax.

Based upon the Koran (9:29), the poll or capitation tax was variously interpreted: 1. as payment in exchange for protection, 2. as an act of mercy, 3. as an act of humiliation, and 4. as punishment for unbelief. See Nicholas Aghnides, *Mohammedan Theories of Finance with an introduction to Mohammedan Law and a Bibliography* (New York, 1916), pp. 377-97 and 398-408.

Here the allocation of the money derived from the *haratsi* and *zeteia* to repay the debt of the metropolis is made in order to guarantee repayment. See No. XXXIV where the *zeteia* is similarly used by Patriarch Parthenios.

In time, the poll tax came to represent all the above interpretations and was required of all legally responsible persons. Further, the *haratsi* was collected for the Ottoman authorities by bishops and metropolitans and could, therefore, be used by them for other purposes before its appointed time of delivery.

4. A notation on No. LXXII *verso* informs us that at the signing of this promissory note (1 May 1687), Kallinikos was the *former* Metropolitan of Crete, and that the note was confirmed by the *present* Metropolitan. This is a welcome explanation, for otherwise we would be presented with the difficulty of explaining the simultaneous presence of both a Metropolitan and a Proedros of Crete. Apparently, Kyrillos neglected to sign as the *former* Metropolitan.

5. 1 May 1687 is the earliest reference to Athanasios of Crete. *Dictionnaire* (XIII, 1036) lists Athanasios in 1688 and his death in 1697.

6. Chaldia, near Trebizond, was one of the twenty-four archdioceses under the immediate jurisdiction of the Patriarchate; see Papadopoulos, *Studies*, 118-20 for the complete list.

My search for archbishops of Chaldia has revealed only one other bishop in addition to Gregory, namely, Germanos, cited in 1667; Gedeon, *Diataxeis*, I, 58. *Dictionnaire* (XII, 28) cites a Gregory from 1680-5 May 1681. It cannot, however, be determined if this is our Gregory.

## NO. XL. A POWER OF ATTORNEY

ἐπιτροπικὸν γράμμα.

Official copy.

15 June 1687.

Grand Logothetes John empowers Bartholomew of Naupaktos and Arta<sup>1</sup> to collect two promissory notes of 1,000 *grosia* each owed to John by two officials of the late Voevode Doukas.

Signed by: † John Karyophylles, Grand Logothetes of the Great Church.

Witnessed by: † Bartholomew of Heraclea † Kyrillos of Kyzikos † Meletios of Nicomedia † Gabriel of Chalcedon † Parthenios of Rhodes † Gregory of Didymoteichon † Makarios of Derkos † Gregory of Chios † Ioasaph of Paronaxia.<sup>2</sup>

The document appears to have been written by John Karyophylles.

Seal is identical with that in No. XIII.

---

1. A diocese since the fourth century, Naupaktos extended over most of western Greece. In the fourteenth century the diocese of Arta was added because of the great losses suffered by the latter; *Dictionnaire*, IV, 766. In the Ottoman period the Metropolis of Naupaktos and Arta ranked between twenty-first and twenty-fifth among the metropoleis; Papadopoulos, *Studies*, p. 111. Metropolitan Bartholomew does not appear elsewhere in the MS.

2. In the Ottoman period the Metropolis of Paronaxia ranked between forty-second and sixty-second among the metropoleis. The diocese of Naxos, however, dates back to the middle of the fifth century; Papadopoulos, *Studies*, p. 113, and *Atlas*, p. 197.

Metropolitan Ioasaph is attested in February of the same year as that of the present document (Delikanes, *Engrapha*, II, 405 and 410), as well as in 1691; Zakythenos, *Engrapha*, II, p. 394.

## NO. XLI. A GROUP PROMISSORY NOTE

ὁμολογητικὸν γράμμα.

Official copy.

15 December 1688.

Lacking the necessary funds to pay the imperial tax,<sup>1</sup> the undersigned commissioned Diamantes, the furrier, to borrow for them 500 *aslania*.

Terms: one month interest will be fixed by Diamantes.

Signed by the borrowers: † Grand Protopapas John, the priest<sup>2</sup>  
 † George Rosetos † Drakos Eupragiotes † Demetrios Kospazos  
 † Protekdikos Andronikos<sup>3</sup> † George Mouselemes † Dikaiophylax Spantones<sup>4</sup>  
 † Chrysanthos the Priest † George Mamonas † Hatze Gourles † Hatze Giakoumes  
 † Stamates the furrier † Panagiotes † Anastases the furrier † Kostas the furrier † Prokopes son of . . .<sup>5</sup>

1. The imperial tax is a general reference for the *haratsi*. See Gennadios, *Synteresis*, p. 324.

2. The Protopapas (the first among priests) together with the Sakellarios, the Sakelliou, the Grand Oikonomos, and lay officials such as the Protekdikos, Protonotarios, and the Primikerios, composed the Patriarchal Council which dealt with the affairs of the Archdiocese of Constantinople, in distinction from those of the Patriarchate, which were handled by a synod of metropolitans; see Gennadios, *Photieios*, II, p. 19.

3. This is Rhetor Andronikos Rankaves (see No. XXV), who in Nos. LIX, LX, and LXI is cited at Grand Chartophylax, while in No. LXXX he is Grand Skevophylax. See C. G. Patrinoles, «Πατριαρχικά Γράμματα . . .», *Ἑπετηρίς Μεσαιωνικοῦ Ἀρχείου*, XII (1962), pp. 152-155.

4. Dikaiophylax Spantones appears again in No. XLV.

5. The signatories following Chrysanthos appear nowhere else in the MS and are otherwise unknown.

## NO. XLII. A SETTLEMENT BETWEEN GRAND LOGOTHETES JOHN AND STEPHANES

γράμμα.

Official copy.

20 March 1689.

Money held for the late Alexios, son of Nikos from Jannina, by the late Grand Rhetor Manouel is claimed by Alexios' brother Stephanes from Manouel's father, Grand Logothetes John.<sup>1</sup> Since Alexios could not produce any proof, and John, while acknowledging the deposit, had no record of the amount, a settlement was reached through the intervention of "useful people." John agrees to give Stephanes 50 out of the 80 *grosia* said to have been deposited with his late son.

Witnessed by: † Kyrillos of Kyzikos † Logothetes Chourmouzes † Protapostolarios Paraskeuas † Ostiarios Diamantes<sup>2</sup>

†Ioakeim . . . † Spantones and † Diamantes Chrysochos.<sup>8</sup>

---

1. Manouel (Manolakes) Karyophylles' death necessitated his father's action, since the latter was his heir.

2. Ostiarios Diamantes is cited as a witness in Nos. XLV and XLIX. His earliest and latest mention in the MS: 20 March 1689-27 October 1693.

3. It is difficult to determine in this instance, as in many others, whether Chrysochos is a surname or merely indicates the person's occupation: in this instance, jeweler.

### NO. XLIII. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF MAKARIOS OF MELENIKON

Official copy.

15 May 1689.

Makarios of Melenikon promises to repay Grand Logothetes John 900 *aslania* borrowed by Makarios' predecessor, Dionysios, who had resigned. In addition, Makarios promises to repay an additional 50 *aslania* representing his ordination gift.

Terms: 50 *aslania* the first year, and 150 annually for the next six years.

Signed by: † Makarios of Melenikon.<sup>1</sup>

Witnessed by: † Neophytos of Heraclea<sup>2</sup> † Gabriel of Chalcidon † Makarios of Nicaea<sup>3</sup> † Methodios of Thessalonike<sup>4</sup> † Athanasios of Tirnovo<sup>5</sup> † Makarios of Methymna † Arsenios of Selymvria<sup>6</sup> † Nicodemos of Derkos.<sup>7</sup>

The accuracy of the copy is confirmed by: † Neophytos of Heraclea † Kyrillos of Kyzikos † Dikaiophylax Chourmouzes.<sup>8</sup>

---

1. A Metropolis in present day Bulgaria, Melnik ranked between thirty-third and thirty-fifth among the metropoleis of the Patriarchate; Papadopoulos, *Studies*, p. 113.

This is the only reference I have found to Makarios. His predecessor is attested on 9 March 1689; Gennadios, *Photieios*, I, 174. Hence the change in the Metropolis of Melnik occurred between 9 March and 15 May of the same year.

2. Neophytos succeeded Sophronios at Heraclea sometime between October 1688 and April 1689; Delikanes, *Engrapha*, II, 422; Gennadios, *Photieios*, II, 6; and Papadopoulos-Kerameus,

*Bibliothèque*, I, 213. It is said that he continued until 1710 (Θ.Χ.Ε., II, 843), but I have been able to attest him only as late as March 1702; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Bibliothèque*, I, 347.

3. This is the only reference I have found to Makarios of Nicaea. His predecessor can be attested as late as 1 May 1687; Delikanēs, *Engrapha*, II, 405 and 410. Hence Makarios was elected Metropolitan of Nicaea sometime between this date and the date of our promissory note, 1 May 1689.

4. As the chief ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Exarchate of Eastern Illyricum, the Church of Thessalonike was subject to Rome until 733. A decree issued by Emperor Leo III (717-741) placed Thessalonike under the jurisdiction of Constantinople; Konidares, *Metropoleis*, p. 26; Tomadakes, *Crete*, pp. 68-69.

In the Ottoman period Thessalonike's rank was either ninth or tenth with eleven suffragan dioceses; Papadopoulos, *Studies*, p. 107.

Earliest reference to Methodios is July 1687 (Mystakides, *Katalogoi*, p. 176); the last, 15 May 1689. Five months after he signed the above promissory note, Methodios was no longer Metropolitan of Thessalonike. His successor, Ignatios, is cited in October of 1689; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Bibliothèque*, I, 213. Mystakides (*Katalogoi*, p. 176) cites Methodios' deposition in 1696. If true, this date must refer to a second deposition.

5. Athanasios appears here only in our MS. However, he is attested thrice in the same year elsewhere; see Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Bibliothèque*, p. 213; Germanos, *Katalogoi*, p. 357; and Gennadios, *Photieios*, II. In 1692 he became Metropolitan of Adrianople; Germanos, *Thrake*, II, 179.

6. Selymvría (on the sea of Marmara about thirty-five miles from Istanbul) had been a diocese since the fourth century, an archdiocese since the middle of the sixth century (Konidares, *Metropoleis*, p. 70), and a metropolis since 1271; Elpinike Sarante, *Ἀπὸ τὴν Ἀνατολικὴν Θράκην: Ἡ Σηλυμβρία καὶ τὰ γύρω της χωρία* (Athens, 1956), p. 15.

Arsenios does not appear again in the MS. He is cited on October 1688 (Delikanēs, *Engrapha*, II, 422) and on September 1689; *Ibid.*, p. 430. He was deposed and signed his own formal resignation on 10 May 1701; Germanos, *Thrake*, I, 119, note 6.

7. Nicodemos I succeeded Makarios (see No. XVII, note 7 above) as Metropolitan of Derkos in September, 1688; Germanos,

*Thrake*, I, 66; Delikanēs, *Engrapha*, II, 422 and 448; Gedeon, *Chronika*, p. 168; and Siderēs, *Derkos*, p. 327.

Nicodemos is further attested in 1706 (Legrand, *Documents*, p. 327) and 1707; *Dictionnaire*, XIV, 316. He is said to have died in office in 1731 when Samouel was elected; Germanos, *Thrake*, I, 67; Siderēs, *Derkos*, 327. However, there may be some confusion here since there are three metropolitans with this name between the years 1688 and 1720 according to *Dictionnaire*, XIV, p. 316.

8. Chourmouzes also appears as *Dikaiophylax* in No. XLIX below.

#### NO. XLIV. A DOWRY SETTLEMENT

γράφμα.

Official copy.

25 January 1690.

Manolakes Kontares, acting for his mother Helenitza, claims and receives the dowry of his sister Fioritza, who died childless, from her husband, Protovestiarios Andronakes.<sup>1</sup> Andronakes, however, retains all gifts made to his wife before and during their marriage.<sup>2</sup> Only Fioritza's funeral expenses are deducted from the total amount.

Confirmed by: † the Patriarch.<sup>3</sup>

Signed by: † Helene wife of Kontaratos (= Kontares)<sup>4</sup>  
† Andronakes son of the Grand Logothetes.

Witnessed by: † Grand Ekklesiarches Ralakes Karyophylles  
† Klemes of Chalcedon † . . . . . of . . . . . † . . . . .  
of . . . . . † Protonotarios George Mouselemes<sup>5</sup> † Logothetes  
Chourmouzes † Protapostolarios Paraskevas † Spantonēs son of  
Gavrilaskos † Diamantes son of Gavrilaskos † Limperes son of  
Sevastos the priest.

---

1. Protovestiarios Andronakes is the son of John Karyophylles. His own death followed his wife's within the same year; see No. XXXVIII, note 1.

2. On the question of the jurisdiction and ownership of a dowry, a principle of Greek law prevailed in Byzantium over its Roman counterpart. Unlike Roman law, which gave the husband

complete jurisdiction and ownership of his wife's dowry and permitted him to retain it even after her death, Greek law granted the husband jurisdiction over the dowry, but stipulated that it belonged to her and reverted back to her family in the event of her death without issue. This principle was followed throughout the Ottoman period; see George S. Simonetes, «Αἱ περιουσιακαὶ σχέσεις τῶν συζύγων κατὰ τὸ Ἀρχαῖον Δίκαιον. Ἐπιδράσεις αὐτοῦ μέχρι τῆς Ἑξαβίβλου τοῦ Ἀρμενοπούλου καὶ τῶν ἐν Ρουμανίᾳ Ἑλληνικῶν Κωδικοποιήσεων», *Τόμος Κωνσταντίνου Ἀρμενοπούλου ἐπὶ τῇ ἑξακοσιετηρίδι τῆς Ἑξαβίβλου αὐτοῦ* (Thessalonike, 1952), pp. 551-622.

3. Patriarch Kallinikos II Akarnan, who confirmed the settlement above, was born in Kastanea (Diocese of Agraphos), Greece. From the Metropolis of Prousa, he was elevated to the Patriarchal dignity at an episcopal council meeting held in the home of Manolakes the Kastorian on 3 March 1688; Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 607; Grumel, *Chronologie*, p. 439. His enthronement followed on the next day.

Kallinikos' rule was one of relative peace until he deposed Neophytos of Adrianople and replaced him with Klemes of Chalcedon. In retaliation, Neophytos succeeded through friends at the Sultan's court, not only in removing Kallinikos on 27 November 1688, but also in succeeding him as Patriarch; Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 607. Neophytos IV, however, only lasted four months (27 November 1688 to 7 March 1689). Shortly afterwards, Kallinikos succeeded his rival (condemned by a synod for acquiring the Patriarchate dignity through lay assistance) and became Patriarch for a second time. Kallinikos remained in office from 7 March 1689 to July/August 1693. Expelled in favor of Dionysios IV (August 1693 to April 1694), Kallinikos returned again and remained Patriarch until August 1702; Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 607.

Kallinikos, noted for his wise and efficient administration, succeeded in greatly reducing the enormous patriarchal debt, and in dying in office. The latter especially was indeed a rare accomplishment, *ibid.*; see also Mertzios, *Patriarchika*, p. 83. It was also in his patriarchate that the office of Primikerios was promoted to the second *pentas*, after the Dikaiophylax, but before the Logothetes; Gedeon, *Pinakes*, p. 612.

4. This is Helenitzia, the mother referred to in the text.

5. Also appears as a witness in No. LIV. His dates, according to the MS, are 25 January 1690 to 24 March 1698.

## NO. XLV. A LETTER OF SETTLEMENT

ἑξωφλητικὸν γράμμα.

Official copy.

15 April 1690.

Manouel Chrysochos, son-in-law of Sultana, collects 63 *grosia* from Grand Logothetes John for his daughter Balasa. The money was deposited with John by Manouel's late wife also named Balasa.

Witnessed by: † Grand Oikonomos George<sup>1</sup> † Dikaiophylax Spantones † Protapostolarios Paraskevas † Ostiarios Theodorakes (=Theodore)<sup>2</sup> † Manoles the bakales [grocer] † Michael the bakales [grocer] † Logothetes Chourmouzes.

---

1. This is the first instance in the MS where the once mighty office of Grand Oikonomos appears; the second is No. XLIX.

The Oikonomos (always a clergyman) managed the property and income of the Church. Codinus (*De officiis*, p. 3) places the Grand Oikonomos in the first rank of the first *pentas*. In the Ottoman period, however, the office was superseded in importance and authority by the lay offices; see Papadopoulos, *Studies*, pp. 83-84. Perhaps, the fact that it continued to be held by a clergyman explains in part the reason for its decline.

Grand Oikonomos George does not appear elsewhere in the MS.

2. Ostiarios Theodorakes is also attested in No. XLIX. In the MS his dates are 15 April 1690 to 27 October 1693.

## NO. XLVI. AN AGREEMENT OF DANIEL OF ANCHIALOS

γράμμα.

Official copy.

6 January 1691.

Due to the diminishing number of faithful, and to general disturbances in his metropolis, Metropolitan Daniel is unable to pay his debts. His creditors, therefore, permit him to suspend interest payments for three years. He agrees to make payments on the principal during this period, after which a new agreement will be drawn.<sup>1</sup>

Signed by: † Daniel, humble Metropolitan of Anchialos.



Confirmed by: † the Patriarch<sup>2</sup> and † Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem.

---

1. The names of the creditors are not recorded.
2. The Patriarch is Kallinikos II; see No. XLIV, note 3.

#### NO. XLVII. A POWER OF ATTORNEY

ἐπιτροπικὸν γράμμα.

Official copy.

25 March 1691.

In order to collect 670 *aslania*, plus interest, owed by Silvester of Nauplion and Argos<sup>1</sup> to Manolakes Karyophylles, the latter empowers the Oikonomos of the Metropolis of Christianoupolis, Presbyter Nicholas, to collect this sum.

Because of Manolakes Karyophylles' death, the power of attorney is confirmed by: † the father and heir (of Nicholas Karyophylles) Grand Logothetes John Karyophylles † the former Dikaiophylax and present Grand Ekklesiarches Ralakes Karyophylles.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Silvester is cited again in No. LVI, but as the former Metropolitan. Ten years later (27 February 1701) Silvester still did not succeed in paying his loan, which at the time of the writing of the above power of attorney was already overdue.

2. Rales or Ralakes served as Dikaiophylax between 15 March 1681 and 1684.

#### NO. XLVIII. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF IOASAPH OF AMASIA

ἐνυπόγραφος καὶ ἐμμάρτυρος ὁμολογία.

20 May 1693.

Official copy.

Ioasaph of Amasia borrows 450 *aslania* from Helenitza (=Helen) Kantakouzenos<sup>1</sup> (wife of the late Aristarches) for diocesan needs.

Terms: Four annual payments of 45 *aslania*. One half of this sum is computed at annual interest. New, less severe, terms will be discussed at the close of this period.

Signed and sealed by: † Ioasaph of Amasia.

Witnessed by: † Kyrillos of Kyzikos † Parthenios of Nicomedia<sup>2</sup> † Klemes of Chalcedon † Parthenios of Iconion.<sup>3</sup>

No. XLVIII, *verso*, indicates that Ioasaph made three annual payments (1694-96) of 22½ *aslania*.

---

1. Appears only here in the MS.

2. Parthenios also appears in Nos. LVI and LXII. He succeeded Meletios sometime between January 1691 and 20 May 1693; Delikanes, *Engrapha*, II, 442, 448; Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Bibliotheke*, I, 353; and Zakythenos *Engrapha*, II, p. 394. He is last referred to on 1 August 1715 (No. LXII). Thus, Delikanes, *Engrapha*, II, 284, who cites Paisios on May 1715, is wrong. Paisios did succeed Parthenios, but sometime after 1 August 1715.

3. Konya in present day Turkey. The Christian community of Iconion is first cited in the first century; Acts 13:51 and 2 Timothy 3:11. In the sixth century it had sixteen suffragan bishops. But the later Turkification of the area wiped out all of these, and only the metropolis remained during the Ottoman period; *Atlas*, p. 19.

#### NO. XLIX. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF BARTHOLOMEW SON OF VRANAS

ἐνυπόγραφος καὶ ἐμμάρτυρος ὁμολογία.

27 October 1693.

Official copy.

Bartholomew son of Vranas, from the island of Antigone,<sup>1</sup> borrows 240 *grosia* from Kyrillos of Kyzikos.<sup>2</sup>

Terms: Ten months.

Witnessed by: † Skevophylax Balases<sup>3</sup> † Protekdikos Span-tones<sup>4</sup> † Dikaiophylax Chourmouzes † Rhetor Manouel<sup>5</sup> † Osti-arios Diamantes † Ostiarios Theodorakes (Theodore).

---

1. Present day Burgas, one of the Princes' Islands in the Propontis.

2. See No. XXVIII, note 4. Kyrillos is the only Metropolitan in the MS who lends money.

3. When Alexander Mavrokordatos succeeded John Karyophylles as Grand Logothetes, Grand Chartophylax Balases as-

sumed the office of Grand Skevophylax vacated by the former. This is the only attestation for Balases as Grand Skevophylax. His dates: sometime after March 1691 to as late as 27 October 1693; see Gedeon, *Chronika*, p. 192.

4. Spantonos also signs as Protekdikos in No. LIV. His dates for this office in the MS are: 27 October 1693 to 24 March 1698.

5. Rhetor Manouel is first mentioned in January 1691; Delikanos, *Engrapha*, II, 443. His dates are January 1691 to 27 October 1693.

#### NO. L. A SETTLEMENT OF AN ESTATE

γράμμα.

Copy.

1696.

George, son of the late Laskarakes Rossetos, declares that he has come of age and no longer requires the services of his uncle Ralakes as guardian. In addition, he confirms that his sister Kokona, his brother Alexander, and he have received an equal share from their father's estate. George also renounces any further claims on his uncle Ralakes.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. This is the first of five documents in the MS referring to the affairs of the Rossetos' family; others are Nos. LI, LII, LIII, LIV, and LX.

Members of the Rossetos family who appear in the MS are: Laskares Rossetos (Nos. XXIV, XXVIII *verso*, L, LI, and LIV); his sons, George (L, LI, LII, LIV) and Alexander (L, LIII, LIV); his daughter Kokona, married to Demetrios Eupragiotes (L, LIII); his relatives Michael Rossetos (LII) and Skarlatos Rossetos the Grand Chartophylax (LI, LII, LIII, LIV); and his sister Smaragda Rossetos, married to Ralakes Karyophylles (LX).

The uncle referred to in the text is Ralakes Karyophylles.

The Rossetos family figures prominently in the history of the Patriarchate. See Sathas, III, 17-19, 52-53.

#### NO. LI. A SETTLEMENT OF AN ESTATE

ἐνυπόγραφον καὶ ἐμμάστιγον γράμμα.

23 March 1697.

Official copy.

George Rossetos declares and affirms that a sealed box filled

with *florins*, and another of silver, entrusted to his uncle Ralakes by his father Spatharios Laskarakes, has been delivered to him intact. The money is divided among the three children.<sup>1</sup> George renounces any further claims on his uncle.

Signed by: † George Rossetos.

Witnessed by: † Kyrillos of Kyzikos † Grand Chartophylax Skarlatos Rossetos<sup>2</sup> † Repherentarios Manouel<sup>3</sup>.

George Rossetos' seal is a hexagon, 1 by 1 cm., with an inscription too faint to be read.

---

1. That is, Kokona and Alexander; see No. L.

2. Skarlatos Rossetos also appears as Grand Chartophylax in Nos. LII, LIII, and LIV. Earliest and latest mention in the MS: 23 March 1697 — 24 March 1698.

3. Repherentarios Manouel also appears in No. LIV. Earliest and latest mention in the MS: 23 March 1697 — 24 March 1698.

#### NO. LII. A SETTLEMENT OF AN ESTATE

γράμμα.

Official copy.

27 April 1697.

Demetrios Eupragiotes declares that all monies and other valuables left in trust by his father with Ralakes<sup>1</sup> have been received by him and the other heirs. After deductions of 2,222 *florins* for funeral expenses and debts, each receives 1,816 *florins*. The settlement takes place in the presence of relatives: Michalakes (Michael) Rousetos,<sup>2</sup> Skarlatos Rousetos, and Drakos Eupragiotes.

Signed by: Demetrios Eupragiotes.<sup>3</sup>

Witnessed by: † Grand Chartophylax Skarlatos Rossetos † Demetrios Joulianos.<sup>4</sup>

Demetrios Eupragiotes' seal is 1.6 cm. in diameter, with a Turkish inscription.

---

1. Ralakes Karyophylles.

2. Whenever members of the Rossetos family sign documents, they spell their name 'Ρωσσέτος, Nos. XLI, LI, LII, LIII, and LIV. In the texts of Nos. XXIV, L, LII, LIV, and LX, however, the name appears as 'Ρουσέτος and 'Ρωσέτος in Nos. XXIV, XXXV,

and XXVI. In my notes I have used Rossetos throughout, but have preserved the various forms in the texts.

3. Demetrios appears again in No. LIII.

4. Demetrios Joulianos appears again in LII. In 1714 he became Grand Logothetes, and retained this office until 1721; Gedeon, *Chronika*, p. 192.

### NO. LIII. A DECLARATION OF DEMETRIOS EUPRAGIOTES

γράμμα.

Official copy.

28 April 1697.

Demetrios Eupragiotes, husband of the late Kokona Rossetos, declares that his late wife held no claim to his father-in-law's house in Constantinople, or to other property located in Great Reuma.<sup>1</sup> These, Demetrios confirms, belong to George and Alexander Rossetos, his two brothers-in-law, with whom he promises to share the money from four promissory notes, two owed by Patriarch Kallinikos,<sup>2</sup> one by the Metropolitan of Tirnovo,<sup>3</sup> and another by the Metropolitan of Adrianople.<sup>4</sup>

Signed and sealed by: † Demetrios Eupragiotes.

Witnessed by: † Grand Chartophylax Skarlatos Rossetos  
† Demetrios Joulianos † Theodorakes.

---

1. Present day Arnaout Koyü, a suburb of Istanbul. In Byzantine times it was called Michaelion; Gennadios, *Photieios*, II, 45. In 1696, under Mustapha II, Great Reuma was granted a status of autonomy; *ibid.*, p. vii. Throughout the Ottoman period, it contained a substantial Greek population.

2. Patriarch Kallinikos II: see No. XLIV, note 3.

3. Possibly, Theodosios; Delikanes, *Engrapha*, II, 452.

4. Athanasios, former Metropolitan of Tirnovo, was translated to Adrianople in 1692; *ibid.* He became Patriarch in 1709. Germanos, *Thrake*, I, 42.

### NO. LIV. SETTLEMENT OF THE ESTATE OF ALEXANDER ROSSETOS

ἐξωφλητικὸν γράμμα.

Official copy.

24 March 1698.

George Rossetos confirms that he has received all the worldly

goods of his late brother Alexander from Grand Rhetor Ralakes,<sup>1</sup> appointed the latter's executor by Imperial decree, and has no further claims on him. In addition, he disavows any claim on two female slaves Anna and Anitza,<sup>2</sup> set free by Alexander prior to his death.

Signed by: † George Rossetos.

Witnessed by: † Kyrillos of Kyzikos † Kaisarios the Hiermonk † George Mouselemes, † Constantine Drakos † Logothetes Manouel † Protekdikos Spantones † Grand Chartophylax Skarlatos Rossetos † Repherentarios Manouel.

---

1. Grand Rhetor Ralakes Karyophylles.

2. It seems strange that a subject people would be permitted slaves. In addition to this reference, I have encountered three others: (1) in a Patriarchal document edited by M. Gedeon, *Diataxeis*, I, p. 172, (2) in a deed from Smyrna dated 1691; *Kostes*, pp. 169-70, (In the latter instance, the slave mentioned was worth 125 *aslania*; *ibid.*, p. 170.) and (3) in the "Life of St. Antonios the Athenian," Nikodemos the Agiorite, *Νέον Μαρτυρολόγιον* (Athens, 1961), p. 195.

#### NO. LV. A PROMISSORY NOTE OF IGNATIOS OF THESSALONIKE

ἐνυπόγραφος ὁμολογία.

Copy.

5 June 1700.

Succeeding Methodios as Metropolitan of Thessalonike,<sup>1</sup> Ignatios assumed a debt of 600 *aslania* left by the former. After the collateral had been sold, there remained an outstanding balance of 380 *aslania*. Of this, Ignatios paid 230. But due to the loss of the original note, declared here invalid, a new one is drawn up for the remaining amount of 150 *aslania*.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. See No. XLIII, note 4.

2. The lender is not identified.

(To be continued)

HOLY CROSS GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

ALEXANDER ELCHANINOV, *The Diary of a Russian Priest*. Translated by Helen Iswolsky. English edition prepared by Kallistos Timothy Ware. With an Introduction by Tamara Elchaninov and a Foreword by Dimitri Obolensky. (London: Faber and Faber, 1967) pp. 255. 45s.

It must be considered very unfortunate that Father Alexander Elchaninov (1881-1934) was not able to devote more time to writing. We would have indeed been the richer for it. What he has written—collected in the present volume—gives ample evidence of a man gifted with profound faith, deep understanding, and great learning.

A married priest, keenly aware of the contemporary world, he was, nevertheless, deeply rooted in the spiritual and ascetical tradition of the Orthodox Church. This happy combination makes him, therefore, a valuable counselor for clergymen as well as laymen in the important areas of human concern: love, marriage, faith, sin, ascetism, confession, freedom, and happiness. The ensuing quoted passages are revealing examples of the author's far ranging vision.

To preachers he advises: "Every sermon, every lesson, has meaning and value only when it is the result of personal spiritual experience and knowledge. Every sermon pronounced only with our lips is dead and false, and those who listen always unmistakably feel it."

To those who are married he teaches: "The highest wisdom in marriage is shown by giving full freedom to the person you love, for our human marriage is the counterpart of the marriage in heaven between Christ and the Church, where there is absolute freedom."

To theologians he counsels: "All theological thought, all knowledge of the Church's teaching has no meaning—and, indeed, is impossible—if it does not come from the fullness of a loving and believing heart."

And finally, he says to all: "Love is love only when it is addressed to all without exception. As long as it is directed only towards those whom I love, it is nothing but selfishness."

To read Father Alexander's book is to encounter a man of God "who proved that the road from Athens, may in our time, lead a soul to the heavenly Jerusalem."

N. M. VAPORIS  
Hellenic College

RUDOLF BULTMANN, *The Old and New Man*. Translated by Keith R. Crim (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1967), 79 pages. Paper \$1.50.

This is a collection of three essays by Rudolf Bultmann first published under the title *Der alte und der neue Mensch in der Theologie des Paulus* by Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt in 1964. The essays appeared singly much earlier (1924, 1932 and 1959) and at least one had already been translated. Nevertheless, to have them in English and in one volume is certainly a gain; anything written by Rudolf Bultmann, one of



the sharpest minds of the twentieth century, is worth reading.

The first essay, "The Problem of Ethics in the Writings of Paul," considers the apparent antinomy of the indicative and the imperative, a distinctively Pauline understanding of Christian existence. The indicative expresses that which has been accomplished in Christ and is a present reality, however one may describe it: righteousness, justification or new life. The imperative represents God's ethical demand on the believer. The antinomy consists in that Paul can exhort the Christian to be or to do what he already is or has as a gift: "If we live by the Spirit, let us also walk by the Spirit." It is only apparent and not real because the imperative is grounded in the indicative and both are determined by God's grace. Bultmann's main point, brilliant and subtle, has remained for him essentially unchanged to date and biblical scholarship has acknowledged that the indicative in Paul, as Bultmann strongly argues, expresses God's saving action as an objective reality and should not be interpreted subjectively or psychologically. But Bultmann is on much less firm ground when he interprets Paul's understanding of Christian existence so as to exclude all possibility of change and growth; and when he interprets the indicative so as to minimize the attitude of vigorous moral effort: Paul is full of such language and exhortation. To insist, as Bultmann has been doing, that moral actions of the believer no longer have saving significance because the believer already has salvation as a gift is to play semantics and contradicts Paul's explicit statements that believers, too, will be judged according to their works (e.g., II Cor. 4:10). Under the heavy pressure of *sola fide* and the consequent concern to ascribe everything to God and nothing to man, Bultmann seems to have fallen into the strange antithesis of trying to obliterate human effort while, from another base, emphasizing the necessity of firm decision in Christian existence.

The second essay, "Romans 7 and Paul's Anthropology," has many difficulties, too, partly inherent in Paul's own thinking and partly due again to Bultmann's presuppositions. Bultmann recognizes that Romans 7:7-25 is basically an apology for the goodness and holiness of the law; yet he seems mainly interested in interpreting the chapter as "the situation of man under the law" or what he calls "Jewish existence": the attitude of striving to achieve salvation through one's efforts. This has been an axal point in Bultmann's understanding of Paul and again issues from the exaggerated application of the Pauline principle of justification by faith. Paul, himself, however, does not score the attitude of striving to fulfill God's ethical commandments (e.g., I Cor. 7:19). He attacks rather the attempt to bring Gentile Christians under the discipline of Jewish religious practices—circumcision, dietary regulations and calendar observances—as can be seen most clearly in Galatians. He assails this position because he is convinced that faith in or acceptance of Jesus as the crucified and risen Messiah suffices for the justification of uncircumcised Gentiles. The larger problem consists in the fact that Paul talks about the law in different contexts and one must carefully distinguish them. Justification by faith, contra Bultmann, seems to have a limited function within Pauline theology as Wrede and Schweizer long ago perceived. Today the best way to ex-

plain that function is perhaps to say that justification by faith (in Christ) is Paul's answer to and rejection of the demand that Gentiles submit to Jewish religious observances. Romans 7, however, presupposes an entirely different context—life, sin and death—and has nothing to do with Gentiles, circumcision or justification by faith.

The final essay, "Adam and Christ in Romans 5," is an excellent example of Bultmann at his best: an exegete who himself must now defend against a reading of alien theological interests into the text, in this instance against Karl Barth. Both men are equally unwilling to separate theology and exegesis, but the one is exegetically far more attentive than the other. For Bultmann, the theme of Romans 5 is life or salvation as present and future reality, vs. 1-11 placing the emphasis on the future ("hope") aspect of salvation. The second part of the chapter, says Bultmann, as can be seen from the sharp contrast between Adam and Christ, death and life, and with the stress "all the more" ascribed to Christ and life (vs. 15, 17), emphasizes salvation as a present reality achieved in Christ. Karl Barth, however, according to Bultmann thinks that the main theme of the chapter is human nature and the unity of humanity, vs. 1-11 implying that Christ includes all men within Himself, and vs. 12-21 suggesting that man's original nature is to be discovered in Christ. Barth wants to bring adamic man under the Lordship of Christ. Bultmann finds no such interest in the text and he is right.

THEODORE STYLIANOPOULOS  
*Hellenic College*

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

# THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION FOR MISSION\*

VASIL T. ISTAVRIDIS

## 1. *General Observations*

By reading the question "In what measure does our understanding of the Mission of the Church clarify for us the Aim and Focus of Theological Education?"<sup>1</sup> and the statement "Theological Education for Mission"<sup>2</sup> one immediately tends to think about the missionary activity of the Church to those outside of Her, on the relation between Church and Mission, Unity and Mission, and the particular problems arising in that important field of Church life and activity.

Theological Education then is called to meet the above challenge in different ways: One, by missionizing the curriculum, as it has been cited in the II Vatican Council. In teaching the dogmatic, biblical, moral and historical branches, they—Seminary and College Professors—should bring to light the missionary aspects contained therein.<sup>3</sup> Two, by establishing a chair or a department on Mission(s) by which a thorough training could be given to the future missionaries. Three, by engaging in a real dialogue with the other faiths and ideologies; and four, by other means.

But the editorial and articles<sup>4</sup> contained in the April 1967

---

<sup>1</sup> World Council of Churches, Study on Patterns of Ministry and Theological Education, World Consultation on Theological Education, to be held 24-29 July, 1967 . . . England, First Circular, Jan. 1967, p. 2 (mime. doc.).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, International Review of Missions, 56 (1967) No. 222.

<sup>3</sup> Decree of the Missionary Activity of the Church, 39. In W. M. Abbott, S.J., ed., *The Documents of Vatican II* (New York, 1966), p. 627.

<sup>4</sup> James F. Hopewell, Director of the Theological Education Fund, Guest Editorial, pp. 141-4. *Idem.*, Mission and Seminary Structure, pp. 158-163. John V. Taylor, General Secretary of the Missionary Society, London, Preparing the Ordinand for Mission, pp. 145-157. Werner Krusche, Professor, Theological Seminary in Leipzig, Some Questions about Theological Education, pp. 164-6. C. S. Song, Principal of Taiwan

---

\* Paper read at the World Consultation on Theological Education, July 24-29, 1967, London College of Divinity, Northwood, Middlesex, England.

issue of the *International Review of Missions*, dedicated to "Theological Education for Mission," all, with the possible exception of the article of Dr. Margull, deal with the general Mission of the Church within the context of the present world. All authors, Hopewell, Taylor, Krusche, Song, Webber, Margull, d'Epinay, although coming from different ecclesial and cultural backgrounds, mainly Anglican and Protestant, seem to depart from the same ecclesiological point of view, that is, if I understand correctly, the acceptance of the Church in functional and dynamic terms, leaving aside her ontological or institutional aspect. In this way the Church should always adapt Herself to the ever changing needs of the present world, with Ministers and Theological Education following the same line.

Two contemporary Orthodox Theologians, presently living in the West, clearly express their opinion on this problem. Professor Nissiotis, speaking on the Church and Her Mission says:

The first difficulty we face is: where is the starting point of our discussion? There are those who maintain that everything must be examined on the basis of the Church alone, its existing historical continuity, its undeniable present reality which potentially englobes the whole world. There are others who, without denying this presupposition, believe that the world and the church mission for it obliges the Church to change in its approach to this problem in order to meet the needs of the contemporary world.

His answer to this difficulty seems to be a combination of the above two elements within the Church.

The first contact with the nature of the Church comprises both its being rooted in the foundation of the Church by Christ in His Holy Spirit, and its movement inside and towards outside, manifesting itself as a living organism precisely by this "inward to outward" movement. Life is taken here not only as a show of principles, not as a performance

---

Theological College, Taiwan, Theological Education and Diversified Ministries, pp. 167-172. G. W. Webber, supervises the Metropolitan Intern Program of Union Theological Seminary, Training for Urban Mission, pp. 173-9. Hans J. Margull, Professor of Missions at Hamburg University, Teaching Mission, pp. 180-4. Christian d'Epinay, Assistant in Sociology at the University of Geneva, The Training of Pastors and Theological Education, The Case of Chile, pp. 185-192.

of a task imposed by obedience to the Church, but life which bears at the same time the marks of energy of the Holy Spirit and of the human action in Him.<sup>5</sup>

Fr. Alexander Schmemmann, looking at the Church as an institution, says:

The nature of the institution can be termed sacramental, and this means not only a given or static inter-dependence between the visible and the invisible, nature and grace, the material and the spiritual, but also, and primarily, the dynamic essence of the Church as passage from the old into the new, from this world into the world to come, from the kingdom of nature into the kingdom of Grace.<sup>6</sup>

Coming back to the II Vatican Council we clearly see the Roman Catholic Church speaking in two ways. One, of Herself mainly through the dogmatic constitution on the Church; and two, on the Church *ad extra*, mainly through the pastoral constitution on the Church in the Modern World. Upon this two-fold vision depends the decree on Priestly Formation, which is of importance to our discussion here.

One criticism which could be leveled at those who would stress the functional and dynamic aspects of the Church is that it would make Her perhaps too much out-worldly, one-sided, alienated from Her essential being and reality. And if we try to adapt the aim and focus of Theological Education to this principle we might be in danger of making theology much too out-worldly and one-sided.

The approach given to ecclesiology reflects also upon the understanding of the forms and functions of the Christian Ministry. In the different studies an accord, more or less, exists on a dynamic and functional Ministry, with the constant need for more and more specialization.

## 2. *Specific Observations*

Mr. Hopewell, due to his position as Director of the Theo-

---

<sup>5</sup>N. A. Nissiotis, "The Ecclesiological Foundation of Mission from the Orthodox Point of View," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, VII (1961/2) 26, 28.

<sup>6</sup>Alexander Schmemmann, "Ecclesiological Notes." Paper read at the Institute for Contemporary Theology, Montreal, July 1965. *St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly*, XI (1967) 36-37.

logical Education Fund, has a worldwide experience on Theological Education, and in a Consultation like the one which meets here his voice should be heard. He finds unanimity on the need for change.

Something must change the seminaries, something of major consequence, something — to use current language — that is radical, creative, revolutionary.

There is no consensus, however, about what this something may actually be.

He relates the change to the two points stated above. He says, "Yet theological education requires external, carping criticism. . . . Nor have seminaries ever lacked critics." The most acute critics come out of the seminaries. To these there have recently been added several new instruments of criticism, such as: the associations of theological schools, the periodicals on Theological Education, conferences, denominational commissions, foundations, councils of Churches and the World Council of Churches.<sup>7</sup>

Sharp criticism may be applied and changes can be made in places where the Church enjoys the full freedom of life and existence and seminaries accordingly have all the academic freedoms. But what about the opposite?

His study *Mission and Seminary Structure*<sup>8</sup> is very interesting. In its first part Mr. Hopewell is bold enough to imagine what kind of structure would a theological school have in the vacuum, without any pre-existing knowledge or type. In the second part he gives tentative approaches, speaking on seminary location, theological students, teaching methods and continuing education.

One element which seems to be lacking in the present as well as past studies is the relation and importance of monastic life and holiness to Theological Education. Monasticism and holiness are real expressions of Christian life and have played a great role in shaping and expressing theology throughout history.<sup>9</sup>

Canon Taylor in his study *Preparing the Ordinand for Mission*,<sup>10</sup> finds the ministers out of touch with present realities, science and civilization.

<sup>7</sup> Guest Editorial, pp. 141-4.

<sup>8</sup> Pp. 158-163.

<sup>9</sup> Elias Mastroyiannopoulos, *Theology and the Saints*, Mim. Doc. in Greek, 24.2. 1967.

<sup>10</sup> Pp. 145-157.

Philosophers and many scholars will not agree with his attack on synthesis. After presenting some examples from history, he bluntly says:

Since, then, history suggests that every human synthesis ends as a tower of Babel, let us have the courage to define ministry in terms of function rather than hierarchy, and train accordingly.<sup>11</sup>

He then finds five types of ministry, using as symbols the gifts from Ephesians 4, apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers, which he applies with great ingenuity to the present needs. He points to the need for a general introductory course for all five types of ministry before proceeding to the immediate specialization.

One of the great achievements of our epoch is definitely specialization, which, however, contains some inherent weaknesses. By it we lose a sense of coherence and wholeness of our human existence and culture.

The present study does not seem to say anything on the pressing needs for ordinands and ministers in many Churches and the way by which to fill the existing gaps.

Dr. Krusche putting down *Some Questions about Theological Education*,<sup>12</sup> has in his mind the present needs in the German Democratic Republic.

Dr. Song, writing on *Theological Education and Diversified Ministries*,<sup>13</sup> explains the existing needs and the efforts to meet them at Taiwan. He wants the theological seminary to be the avant-garde of the mission of the Church. "Diversified ministries in a general sense aim at helping a student regard his ministry liturgically and diaconically." There are five special projects: (1) The Campus Ministry, (2) The Jericho Project, (3) Puppetry, (4) The Rural Project, (5) Industrial Evangelism. "What we strive to create here in Taiwan Theological College is not so much a theology of the Church as a theology of the Church for mission."

Dr. George W. Webber writes on *Training for Urban Mission*.<sup>14</sup> He has in his mind the urgent problems of urbanization

---

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 150.

<sup>12</sup> Pp. 164-6.

<sup>13</sup> Pp. 167-172.

<sup>14</sup> Pp. 173-9.



and the way the Church and theology could meet them. His solution is:

We must aim to train in an institution for theological education a man who is at once a. a worldly man, b. a man in Christ, and c. a theological specialist.

Dr. Hans Jochen Margull in *Teaching Mission*,<sup>15</sup> gives a report on how to teach a course in mission. His outline is as follows:

1. The World.
2. The World Opened Up.
3. Mission of God I.
4. Mission of God II.
5. The Way of Mission(s).
6. The Ecumenical Way of the Church.
7. Towards the Churches' Presence.
8. The Church in Mission.
9. The Mission of the Congregation.
10. Meeting (Secular, Ideological and Religious) Man.
11. The Call to Hope.
12. The Future of the World.

In treating mission theologically we are presently being led into the broad problems of the meaning of "world" and of the understanding of "history." But talking about the world and history "we actually talked about God and always about the Church, even if we did not mention it."

### 3. *Orthodoxy and the World*

Our discussion has already led us to the relations between God and history, the Church and the world. Some special features of Orthodoxy, such as the eucharistic element, theoretical and monastic life, the stress on eschatology raise the objection that such an ecclesiology leads to an illusory picture of the present realities and leads members of the Church to live outside this world with-

<sup>15</sup> Pp. 180-4.

<sup>16</sup> N. A. Nissiotis, "Interpreting Orthodoxy," *The Ecumenical Review*, XIV (1961) 14.

<sup>17</sup> Seminar of Theologians of Thessaloniki, *God and History According to Orthodox Tradition*, in Greek (Thessaloniki, 1966).

out care for particular social and political developments.<sup>16</sup>

In order to meet these objections, often made by our Western brethren, the Seminar of Theologians of Thessaloniki, headed by Professor S. Agourides of the University of Thessaloniki, studied during the winter of 1965-6 the theme *God and History*, out of which came a substantial volume of 200 pages on the same subject.<sup>17</sup> Professor Agourides sums up<sup>18</sup> the results of the Seminar as such:

1. Eastern theologians are of a common mind accepting in an horizontal line the economy of God during the Old Testament period till the coming of Christ, while the events after Jesus and the day of Pentecost are being looked upon in two ways. The official Church theology sees them horizontally, while monastic theology looks upon them doxologically and in a vertical line. Both lines of approach can be found today within the Orthodox Church. In both cases the way to God runs through the way of our neighbor, that is, through love. Monasticism stands for a reminder to our Protestant brethren of the vertical line in the relations between God and History.

2. The coming of Jesus Christ to this world brought a change in the relations between God and the world. Due to this event it is possible to be, beginning from now, in communion with God.

3. The objection is made that the Orthodox Church does not give due attention to sin and evil, both individually and socially, by not relating them to the will of man but to death and Satan, to powers beyond the will of man. The answer is that Orthodoxy relates sin and death both to the will of man and to death and the demonic powers. The inactivity of the Orthodox Churches in dealing with present problems is largely due to special historical factors.

4. The solution given to Church and State relations in Byzantium has influenced the Church in solving the pressing problems of society and the world.

Today the world is going through a great revolution, covering all phases of our civilization. The Church which is in and lives/works for the world should follow carefully the great evolutionary processes, should recognize the pressing needs and work for the application of Her moral and social principles.

The crucial question today, according to the Metropolitan of

---

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 193-201.

Myra Mgr. Chrysostomos,<sup>19</sup> is: Will the Church be the leader or the bystander in this effort to transform ethically the world in its rapid social change?

The Orthodox Church, due to her ecclesiology and social teachings, to the special conditions under which she found herself in the historic past, and which still persist, is going through, according to the same Professor, a period of attentive observation of the world and changing society, which have not yet reached a satisfactory system, in relation to the new technology and the existing potentialities.

Orthodox theology accordingly has to be a listener to the challenging new messages constantly coming from the world. Orthodox theology has much to gain from the experiences of Western theology, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, as it has so positively gained from other fields of theological endeavor.

The special position given to these questions in the Agenda<sup>20</sup> for the coming Pan-Orthodox Synod, prepared by the I Pan-Orthodox Conference of Rhodes (1961) is a hopeful sign for the future.

---

<sup>19</sup> Personal interview on the points included in this paper. Istanbul, June 27, 1967.

<sup>20</sup> III. Administration of the Church, F. Education of the Clergy. VI. Orthodoxy in the World, A-D. VII. Theological Themes, C-F. VIII. Social Problems, A-E.

#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.